

7

Cerinthus and Ebion:

OR, THE

Heretic of Tything under the Gospel Detected:

IN SOME

OBSERVATIONS

Upon a BOOK Entituled,

An Essay Concerning the Divine Right of Tythes:

By the Author of the *Snake in the Grass*. (Charles Lesley)

Together with an ESSAY concerning the First Rise
of TYTHES:

And an ESSAY against their Divine Right.

*And verily they who are of the Sons of Levi, who receive the Office of the Priest-
hood, have a Commandment to take Tythes of the People according to the
Law, Heb. vii. 5.*

*But ye (viz. Christians) are not under the Law, but under Grace,
Rom. vi. 14.*

*For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the
Law, Heb. vii. 2.*

*For there is verily a disanulling of the Commandment going before (mentioned
in ver. 5. by which the Levites took Tythes of the People) for the weakness
and unprofitableness thereof, Heb. vii. 18.*

*Freely ye (viz. all true Gospel-Ministers) have received, freely give,
Mat. x. 8.*

Benjamin Lindley

LONDON:

Printed by J. Sowle, in White-Hart-Court in Gracious-
Street, 1708.

Compter and Ebnw

And an ESSAY against their

Charles F. Ship

John King

li
bi
it
it
ow
for
na
for
wh
Ty
the
dis
lor
Sin
ing
the
rat
S
into
oth
the
the
they

H I S

Preface Consider'd.

Snake, p. 1. **T**HE Subject of Tythes is the great *Diana* of the *Quakers*, they have bent their whole Force against Tythes, as the likeliest way to overthrow the Church.

Observat. As to the First Part, *unless* he can some way help himself by distinguishing between Tythes, and the Subject of Tythes, it looks very like such a Jest as they call a Bull (as he Phraseth it in p. 72.) for People to bend their whole Force against their own *Diana*.

And as to the Second, this Dissenting Priest insinuates there a foul Surmise against the Conforming Priests, who have the Management of Church Affairs, not at all deserving their thanks; for if they be not of those culpable Hirelings he describes in p. 8. who value the Hire more than the Work, the taking away of Tythes is not likely to overthrow the Church, and if they be, they are Antichrist's Ministers, and the supporting them, is a dishonouring God with our Substance, and renders us Contributors to the Carrying on of a War against him. It is a dangerous Sin to consent to a Crime, sustaining a Curate notoriously offending, gives Alms unwisely against Christ; but none should do this; therefore neither should he supply with Alms such a Lordly Curate, Pastor. Duty, Cap. 8.

Snake Ibid. My Controversie with the *Quakers* has led me into Subjects of different Natures, and engag'd me among other Parties; as when they began to be convinc'd concerning the Necessity and Benefit of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lords Supper, but stuck upon the Administrator, to whom they should go for it; to satisfy them in this, forc'd me di-

His PREFACE Consider'd.

rectly upon the Cause of Episcopacy ; this concern'd other Dissenters, &c.

Observat. *I blame his assurance here to Publish this of the Quakers, not of some of them, but in General Terms, which is an Untruth in Fact, and contrary to his own Knowledge, and was fit to discourage me from proceeding any further ; but I resolv'd against it, though I could like better to have to do with a Man of more sincerity.*

Snake, p. 3. I have not in the following Sheets quoted any of the *Quaker's* Books, or repeated their poor Arguments, which they only pick up and down the High-way, &c. they are all Answered, tho' not named in what follows.

Observat. *That shews his Caution, and there's some Cause for't, for had he follow'd the other and proper Method, his foyle wou'd have been more obvious ; but this way he keeps under Covert, and still hides in the Grass, speaks diminutively of our Arguments, and tells us they are all Answer'd, tho' not Named in what follows, so no body knows where : Is not this a readier way than to stand nibbling at Arguments he cannot deal with ?*

Snake Ibid. But it is very observable to what an excess of Fury and Madness, against all the Institutions of God, their Spirit of Delusion that possessed the *Quakers* did hurry them, even to account this part of the Worship of God, the offering of his Tythes, to be a renouncing of Christ, a denial of his having come in the Flesh, a mark of Antichrist.

Observat. *Had it been another Man, I should have thought it a Contradiction to call it an excess of Fury and Madness against all the Institutions of God, to account this part of his Worship, the Offering of his Tythes, a Renouncing of Christ, &c. nay tho' he intends it of the greatest and highest Act of Worship, as much preferable to verbal Praises, as Deeds are more than Words.* Tet this will not at all do, for however eminent a Part it be, it cannot be the whole, or all, nor that which is the whole or all cannot be a part only, as this or that part implieth ; but he calls it both all and a part in the compass of three or four Lines ; disingeniously chargeth in general, and instanceth in particular ; but it is such a particular as is the main with him ; for it is observable from hence, that with the *Snake* Tythes are all the Institutions of God ; for a Christian opposition of them he calls an excess of Fury and Madness, against all the Institutions of God :

And

His PREFACE Consider'd.

And for his Conclusions, viz. a Renouncing of Christ, &c. he seems to draw them from Tho. Ellwood's Argument, which says, they who pay Tythes, do therein uphold a Legal Ceremony, and thereby deny Christ to be come in the Flesh, which is a mark of Antichrist, 1 Joh. 4. 3. which when Snake comes to Answer, he leaves out these words, [do thereby uphold a Legal Ceremony abrogated by Christ] and so conceals that part of the Argument on which the remaining Parts depend, for it consists of Three Parts.

1. *That they who pay Tythes, do therein uphold a Legal Ceremony abrogated by Christ.*

2. *That by upholding a Legal Ceremony abrogated by Christ, they deny Christ to be come in the Flesh.*

3. *That to deny Christ to be come in the Flesh, is a mark of Antichrist, proved from 1 Joh. 4. 3. See Switch, p. 382.*

So the Conclusion is firm for ought Snake hath said against it, and he might have sav'd Credit, had he let it alone, or told us it was answer'd in what follows, but not named, so we had never known where; the Method he has now taken in the Essay, this had hid his weakness, more than nibbling at it by piece-meal; is this one of our poor Arguments that so much overpowers him that calls them so? And is not every Heresie in some degree or sense a Renouncing of Christ? but Tything under the Gospel is an Heresie; for Jerom in his Epistle to Augustine, calls it the Heresie of Cerinthus and Ebion, to mix the Ceremonies of the Law with the Gospel of Christ. And Ignatius writes to the Philipians, Whosoever shall keep Easter with the Jews, and undertake the Solemnities of their Feasts, partake with them who killed the Lord and his Apostles. Hence is taken that Legal Ceremonial Things and Offerings, of which are Tythes, are deadly after the Suffering of Christ, whom they deny to be come in the Flesh who uphold Tythes, for that supposes him not to be come, and is indeed Heretical by the Greek Fathers, as is cited by the Author of the Chain; so our Judgment of Tythes is no Novelty, we are not singular or alone in it, but have antient Authority on our sides, for this Ignatius lived some part of his time with the Apostles, and we have Jerome, and the Greek Fathers, &c.

And I have to add, that this Doctrine of the Divine Right of Tythes, as the Snake states it, amounts to the denial of the at-
tonement

His PREFACE Consider'd.

tonement and precious Benefit of Christ's death; for if Righteousness came by the Law, then is Christ dead in vain, Gal. 2. 21. But Tythes are Legal, they are number'd among the Offerings of the Law, and distinguished into Heave-Offerings, Numb. 18. 24, &c. but the Tythes of the Children of Israel which they offer as an Heave-offering unto the Lord, &c. so if they be the highest and chief Worship, as Snake makes them, then the greatest Righteousness is come by the Law; and so according to the Apostles Conclusion, Christ dead in vain.

Again, the Scripture is express in it, Gal. 2. 16. that a Man is not justified by the works of the Law, but by the Faith of Jesus Christ; and that by the works of the Law shall no flesh be justified. But if paying Tythes be the chief worship, and highest act of worship, then it is not only preferable to verbal Praises, as Snake saith, but even to Faith in Jesus Christ; and it will follow, that Legal Works have the precedency, and that Justification is rather by Works of the Law, than by the Faith of Jesus Christ.

Therefore the Doctrine of Tythes under the Gospel, is contrary to Scripture, and to the Incarnation of Christ as Past. and to his atonement, and the precious benefits of his Death, and to Justification by Faith in him, and so is wholly Unchristian, and Heretical.

Prof. Snake, p. 7. Mr. Milton Charged the Clergy with the Name of Hirelings, which if it be meant of those who take any thing for their Preaching, it flies directly in the face of our Blessed Saviour, who useth the same word concerning Preachers, saying, the Labourer is worthy of his hire, Luke 10. 7. but if it be meant (as it can bear no other meaning) that they are the culpable Hirelings, who value the Hire more than the Work; that is, to be known only by him that knows the Heart, and can be guest at by us only from Consequences.

Observat. Concerning those whom God calls to be Ministers of his Gospel, if they have Estates of their own, it is their Crown and Glory to make the Gospel without Charge; but otherwise they have a right to a Maintenance; Food and Raiment, as saith Oecolampadius, and it is God's Ordinance, his Maintenance and Allowance to his Ministers; which makes no Man an Hireling, but they must have it by Free Gift, not compulsorily, for
the

HIS PREFACE Consider'd.

the Gospel-Ministers maintenance in the purest times of Christianity, was not such as was compellable by Civil Laws, or stipulated by Contracts, or fixt to a certain Quantum, but commensurate to the Necessities of his Ministers. And all Hirelings are such as are not satisfied and content with God's maintenance and allowance, but would have something more, or other, or after other manner than God has appointed, and so are guilty of Covetousness, or Diffidence; which having premised, I proceed to answer the Quotations more particularly.

As to those who take any thing for their Preaching, it implies Preaching for any thing they so take, and this a sort or kind of Communication, and so inferrs Bartering, Trucking or Exchanging one with or for another, and so makes an Hireling; then Hire and Hirelings are not the same word, nor is the word Hire used here in a proper sense, but by way of Metaphor, or allusion to Labourers in common Work, which thus appears; for take it in this place in a proper sense, and one part of the verse would contradict another, and contradict that great Command, Mat. 10. 8. freely ye have received, freely give; which to admit, were injurious to Scripture; therefore the word Hire must be taken figuratively here.

Then the foregoing-explanatory part of the verse Snake leaves out, I suppose he had no occasion for it, viz. in the same House remain, eating and drinking such things as they give. It seems to have been his Design to conceal this, that he might raise some great Notion from the word (Hire) but what can he make of it now? only a Power to receive Meat and Drink in their Journeys, as their Necessities requir'd, of such as freely gave it, nothing more, or to bring away with them, who carried neither Scrip nor Purse. And seeing the pure Gospel-Rule was such as allowed them (the Apostles and Primitive Ministers) neither Scrip nor Purse, it's not to be thought it should allow their Successors a Tythe-Barn. So from this verse Snake cannot prove any Lands, Revenues or Tythes given to the Priests, or any thing into their Barns, or into their Purses, nor any Institution of Hire or of Hirelings; so it makes nothing for his Purpose—

It's true what the Snake saith, tho' not to be found in the verse he Quotes, but in Joh. 10. 12, 13. that our Saviour useth the word Hireling concerning Preachers, but it was the
false

His PREFACE Consider'd.

false Preachers only, he never useth it concerning the true Preachers, nor any where calleth them Hirelings, but the false Preachers he calls so, and makes it their Badge and distinguishing Character in Scripture, and reprehends them from that description, where he makes an Hireling the false Shepherd (as opposite to himself the true Shepherd;) and one that fleeth when the Wolf cometh, and leaveth the Sheep to be catched and scattered, and careth not for the Sheep; and he is thus perfidious and treacherous because he is an Hireling. The Term carrieth the Corruption in it, and all Hirelings are thus culpable; the Description answereth to them all, none are excepted, or Innocent, though the Snake would infer some to be so, and therein accepts of the Badge of a false Shepherd; for he not only goes about to justify some Hirelings, and make them Innocent, but also endeavours to hide the culpable, whom he owns to be so, who are, he saith, only to be known by him who knoweth the heart, &c. as if he had not given us a Rule to know them by, Mat. 7. 15. 10. 29. ye shall know them by their Fruits; so let us Examine them by this Rule, and we shall find who they are even in the Snake's sense, viz.

• *Them that are not as diligent to Preach without Hire as with it.*

Them that turn their backs of small Benefices for greater.

Them that Ingross more Parishes than they can Personally do the Service of:

Them that make Contracts with their People for so much a Year for Preaching:

And them that by Laws force and compel Tythes from the People.

Now besides the Crimes already enumerated against them, all Hirelings are guilty of the Breach of our Lord's gracious Command, Mat. 10. 8. freely give; and of Simony, which Irenæus makes the first Heresie, and used the word Simoniacks, as a general Name for all Hereticks; saying, Simon was the Father of them all.

Now what use would Simon Magus (from whom Simony has its Name) have made of the Spiritual Gift he sought to purchase of the Apostles, but made it mercenary, and made Gain of it; he would not have been a free Minister of it to others, have freely given according to the Command, Mat. 10. 8. but have
Sold

G. Lipp

HIS PREFACE Consider'd.

Sold it and made a Trade on't ; is not this Simony, and are not all Hirelings now found in the same Practice? making a Trade of (if they have any) Spiritual things (or what is Carnal under that Notion) the Apostle shews how sinful a Thought was Simon's, that the Gift of God might be purchas'd with Money ; and after a most severe Rebuke, directs him to Repent, and pray to God if perhaps this Thought might be forgiven him : And Simon intreats the Apostles, Pray ye to the Lord for me, that none of these things that ye have spoken come upon me.

Here it may be seen how dangerous and wicked is such a thought of purchasing Spiritual things with Money, which in these days if the Hearers had not, they would not part with their Money so ; and if the Preachers had it not, they would be self-convict of Fraud and Cozenage in exacting Money from the People on this score : It were an Iniquity to be punished by the Judge, and if this ungodly thought overspread both Priests and People, how great is the Leprosie?

There is something yet beyond this, which shews the Disease still deeper ; i. e. take a Priest settled in a Parish, and having the Tythes out for his Ministry, yet by an Invention, which I think they call Surplice-Fees, he shall exact particular Payments for the most of the Offices of his Function, and has particular Rates set on them : So here is double Payments, we must pay both by the lump, and by parcel, which is as stratum superstratum, one Lare of Simony upon another ; so that it has concern'd the Snake proportionably as much to have writ an Essay upon the Divine Right of Surplice-Fees, as the Divine Right of Tythes ; and if he can make a Surplice as old as a Sacrifice.

To find in what Errors the Root of this Heresie is to be sought for, I shall thus Introduce my self. God calls and qualifies his own Ministers himself ; I raised up of your Sons for Prophets, and your young Men for Nazarites. But this being in these latter Ages generally disbelieved, or neglected, and School-Learning admitted as a sufficient qualification for a Gospel-Minister, Parents at great Charge Educate their Children in Schools and Colledges, to fit them for the Ministry of the Gospel. Now do they this to the end that their Children should Preach the Gospel freely, according to Christ's Command, Mat. 10. 8. or for worldly Purposes and Preferments, let Conscience speak ; for if it be for the latter, then the Priesthood are design'd to Simony by their
b Parents,

His PREFACE Consider'd.

Parents, are Simoniacs by Paternal Designation and Purpose before they are actually so, and then how Radical is the Distemper? Surely God's Ax is laid to the Root of this Tree!

Snake p. 8. And for St. Paul Preaching Gratis to the Corinthians, and Thessalonians; &c.

Observation. I pass by some part of this Argument here, because it comes under Observation hereafter in the Book; only I must Note concerning the Apostles asserting his Right to have been burthensom as the Apostle of Christ; that instead of Burthensome, is put in the Margin, or used Authority: And in Tremellius's Bible, Quam possumus honorabiles esse tanquam Apostoli Christi, when we might have been Honourable as the Apostles of Christ, which better agrees with the fore-part of the verse (nor of Men sought we Glory, neither of you, nor yet of others) than Burthensome does; but however it can only amount to a maintenance, and Tythes cannot be inferr'd from it.

Pref. Snake p. 15. Says some Men hold (or to that Effect) than the Sin of Belshazar was Excess in Drinking, of which there is not one word in the Text; but the Sin of Sacrilege is there plainly set down, viz. his Prophaning the holy Vessels of the Temple. Yet in the Assemblies Annotations (An. 1646.) upon Dan. 5. 2. they could find no Sacrilege in this: No, nor in the Sin of Achan, Jos. 6. and 7. this was put upon Covetousness, tho' the Text says plainly, that it was for taking what was accursed (that is) Devoted and Consecrated to God, and therefore accursed to any whosoever should invade it. Neither could they find any Sacrilege in the Sin of Ananias, only Covetousness there too.

These two Instances of Achan in the beginning of the Jewish Church, and Ananias in the beginning of the Christian, are set in the front, that all might take notice of God's High Indignation against this Sin of Sacrilege.

I would gladly be inform'd what that Sin of Sacrilege is, if this be not it; i. e. to seize upon Churches, and convert them to common use.

Observat.

HIS PREFACE Consider'd.

Observat. Rudus indigestaque Moles, I would gladly be informed what that Sin of Sacrilege is, if this be not it, to seize upon Churches, &c. the Sin of Sacrilege is there i. e. Dan. 5. 2. plainly set down, viz. Prophaning the Vessels of the Temple; and yet there is no such expression in the whole Chapter, nor of seizing of Churches. Is it true to say a thing is plainly set down, that is not set down at all? tho' it might be gathered by Implication, or Consequence? and if the seizing of Churches, and making use of the things seized be the same thing? is there no difference? Belshazar was not the Seizer, but he drank Wine in the Vessels of the Lord's House, he and his Wives, &c. This Snake would have Sacrilege, and the Sin for which the King was so suddenly and miraculously Punished, but omits his Pride, his Lifting up himself against God, his Praising the Gods of Silver and Gold, &c. and not Glorifying the true God; all which the Scripture chargeth him with, even Sins both of Omision, and Commission, and which contain in them Polytheism, and Idolatry.

But Snake is Silent as to these, that he might deceive us into a Notion that Belshazar's Sin was only drinking in the Vessels of the Lord's House, which he makes Sacrilege, and we know his Design in it.

Snake would gladly be Inform'd what that Sin of Sacrilege is, if, &c. and I think the way to Inform, or be Informed in this Case, is to reduce the word within the bounds of its proper Signification; and then it will appear, to Prophane Holy things is not properly Sacrilege, but to Steal Holy things, as the word imports, a Sacrilegus; it is said Sacrilegius of him; qui Rem Sacram legit, and then there is no Sacrilege to be found in the Case of Belshazar. But we may dismiss it without any more ado, and go on to the Case of Achan, Josh. 6. 7. Achan he took of what was accursed; that is, says Snake, Devoted and Consecrated to God, and therefore accursed to any whosoever should invade it. Here he takes Devoted and Consecrated, as Synonymous terms, which are to be taken as Contraries; for tho' there be in the Margin of some Bibles, Devoted, for Accursed, yet it is to be understood, devota exitio, as is Noted in Tremellius's Latin Bible, which is equal to Accursed, and cannot agree with Consecrated; against which, in the Margin of

HIS PREFACE Consider'd.

the same Bible is put Holiness. What flat Contradiction is this, which makes Accursed and Consecrated the same thing, and Holiness, and devoted to Destruction the same thing? here's neither Religion or Sense in this Exposition, whereby this Snake renders the things of Jericho all without distinction, positively Consecrated, or Holiness, and only accursed consequentially, or secundum quid, as to any whosoever should invade them; which would render all the Host of Israel as Achan. And indeed one that should trust this Snake, would wonder what should move God to destroy this City of Holiness: But we'll Examine the Text, and see (as he makes none) if it make no distinction in the goods of Jericho, if none of them were positively accursed, but all was Holiness within her walls.

The City shall be accursed, even it, and all that are therein to the Lord: Josh. 6. 17 : But all the Silver and Gold, and Vessels of Brasses and Iron, are consecrated unto the Lord: they shall come into the Treasury of the Lord.

Was there ever plainer distinction? Goods of two sorts, the one accursed, the other consecrated; the one might be preserved, and come into the Treasury of the Lord, the other must be utterly destroyed; and Achan took of both sorts: Which Snake jumbles confusedly together, to induce a notion of Sacrilege, which he could not have drawn from the accursed thing. But his Blunder is discover'd, which takes more time to unravel, than Answer. He complains heavily in this Preface of the Quaker's Ignorance and Dulness; but I referr it, whether in the Argument before us, he hath shown much Knowledge and Acuteness or no.

And if he will still Charge Achan with Sacrilege, it must be concerning the Silver and Gold, and not the Garment; to which I offer him his own Argument: That things once Consecrated, can never be alter'd or alienated to other use; and he gives Instance of the Censers that were made Plates for the Altar, but this Silver and Gold was burnt with the rest of the accursed things, and all covered over with a great heap of Stones. So he cannot make Sacrilege on it, and hold his Rule, he must part with the one or the other, which is left to his Choice.

Besides, the Scriptures have reduced these two Instances of Achan and Ananias to several Heads of Crimes, as a Trespass in the accursed thing: Transgression against God's Covenant he had Commanded them. Theft, Dissimulation, Lying to the Holy Ghost,

His PREFACE Consider'd.

Ghost, not to Men, but to God; Agreement or Confederacy to tempt the Spirit of the Lord, but not a word of Sacrilege in all this, nor is it ever mention'd in all the Scriptures but once; and wherever the Scripture has done this for us, to Expound or Explain to us any Instances or Passages therein contained, we ought to acquiesce in such Explanation, before any other Expositions of such as the Snake; Men that would be Wise above what is written.

Then as to the Instance of Ananias, there needs little to be said to it, but what is above, there being nothing like Sacrilege in it; the Money first his own, and then was brought in for common use. Further, as the Word Sacrilege is never used in Scripture but once, and it properly signifies Stealing Holy things; and stealable things being such as have of themselves no Intrinsic Holiness, one thing more than another, nor ever had, but only a Legal Ceremonial Holiness, as Figuring that which was Holy indeed, that of the Gospel Substance, not Figure; it can only exhibit a Legal Ceremonial Nation, which pertains not unto the Gospel Dispensation. So that what Snake fests of doing, he may do in Earnest; drop Sacrilege without any Inconvenience at all.

A N

A N

E P I S T L E

T O T H E

R E A D E R.

I H A D not Read the *ESSAY*, nor it's like had ever heard on't, but for the *Snake's* own Advertizement of it in his *Reply*, where he gives it in Excuse for his not Answering that Excellent *Section*; in which he owns there is more of Argument than in any of the *Switch*, and more than he cared to meddle with, so he skips it over.

Page 232.
Sect. 17.

And under *Numb. 8.* he inserts a Paper Entituled, *The Substance of a Discourse*; and instead of Answering it, saith this is all the Answer the *Quakers* have hitherto given to that *ESSAY*; tho' it was not given as any Answer at all to it; thus he gives that also the go by.

Page 374. And holds on in Contradiction both to Truth and common Sense, saying, this is all the Answer they give to the Arguments proving the Divine Right of Tythes; they Bark at [*It*] as little whiffers do at the Moon, and hurt [*It*] as little. Is not this strange Syntax, to annex a Pronoun Singular to a Noun Plural; and [*It*] Arguments as this is all the Answer they give to the Arguments——they Bark at [*It,*] and hurt [*It*] as little.

This is that haughty Schollar that upbraids *Milton* with Buffoonry, and the *Quakers* with dulness, and so great want of
of

An Epistle to the READER.

of Learning, as to be as fond of a bit of Latine, as a Child of a pair of Breeches, who is thus intangled and caught in his own Nonsense. And who boasts of his [single double *It*] by which Jargon he intends his Arguments in the *Essay*, and then he compares to the Moon. How the Comparison consists with Sense, I Query, but leave it to Grammarians.

And the *Quakers* (contrary to common Civility and good Manners) he compares to little Barking whiffers; from which I infer, that Nonsense and ill Grammar, as well as Rudeness and ill Manners, are to be met with as well from the College as the Coop, from the Priest as the Peasant; and so I leave the *Reply*, to come to the *ESSAY*.

We Read of certain Professors of the Name of Christ, of the *Acts* 15. Sect of the *Pharisees*, who came down from *Judea* to *Antioch*, and said that the Christians of the *Gentiles* ought to be Circumcised, and keep the Law of *Moses* if they would be Saved, disturbing the Souls of many of the Brethren in *Syria* and *Cilicia* with their perverse Doctrine, against whom *Paul* and *Barnabas* chiefly opposed themselves.

Philastrius de Heres. Cap. 87. and *Epiphanius Heres.* 28. say that the Arch-Heretick *Cerinthus* was the first Broacher of this Opinion; of whom, *Jeremy Collier* gives the following Account in his *Great Historical Dictionary*.

“ *Cerinthus* a Disciple of *Simon Magus*, and *Carpocrates*,
“ lived in the First Century, he was one of the Principal
“ Authors of the Dissention which had like to have made a
“ Schism among the Christians, concerning the Observation of
“ Legal Ceremonies; which this Heretick had a mind to In-
“ corporate with Christianity.

Against whom, and *Ebion* a great Propagator of the same Heresie (about the Year of our Lord 72.) Some will needs have it that *St. John* wrote his Gospel; but however it were, *Jerom* in his Epistle to *Augustine*, calls it the Heresie of *Cerinthus* and *Ebion*, to mix the Ceremonies of the Law with the Gospel of Christ.

And

An Epistle to the READER.

And Tything was a Ceremony of the Law, therefore Tything under the Gospel is an observation of a Legal Ceremony, it is a mixing or incorporating a Legal Ceremony with the Gospel of Christ, and so is an Heresie.

It is an upholding a Legal Ceremony which (especially on the foot of Divine Right) deny Christ to be come in the Flesh, which is the worst of Heresie.

Mat. 10. 8. It is an Evil Imitation of *Moses* Law disanulling Christ's, Heb. 7. 12. which disanul'd it; and by the Schoolmens own Rule, Jewish Ceremonies and Rites imposed are deadly; for comparing *Acts* 22. 24, 25, 26, 27. with *Numbers* 6. 18. *Acts* 18. 18. *Acts* 16. 3. they thereupon made this Rule, viz.

That Jewish Observations while the Temple stood were dead, but after the Destruction of it, they were not only dead, but deadly; but the believing the necessity of them was always deadly.

So according to this Rule of their own making (for which see Bishop *Robert Sanderson de oblig. Jurament.*) Tything is now deadly (Paying or Receiving them) and it is otherwise shown they are to be particular, and so to be avoided by all true Christians as deadly Heresie.

As to the Historical Part of this Treatise, I pretend not to have Read at large all the Authors here Quoted, but go upon Collections of Credible Writers I have Read, especially *Richard Richardsons*, in his Book Entitul'd, *A Testimony against Tything among Christians*; being Ceremonial, Typical, and disanul'd by Christ. This I mention once for all, to do Justice to the Memory of that Worthy and Learned Author deceased.

THE Author being far distant from the Press, and not marking the Quotations, the Printer has omitted Noting some of them, which the kind Reader is desir'd to correct, viz.
Page 5. line 9. to 12. P. 23. l. 31. to the end. P. 24. l. 1. to 3. *Ibid.* l. 28. to the end. P. 25. l. 1. to 3. P. 27. l. 37. to 40. P. 31. l. 3. for toyld, r. coil'd. P. 39. l. 5. for ever, r. over.

Cerinthus

Cerinthus and EBION;

OR THE

Hereſie of Tything under the Goſpel detected.

BOOK SECT. I.

THE great Worſhip of God, is our truſt and dependance *Snake p. 4.* upon him, as the Sovereign Diſpoſer of all things in Heaven and on Earth; and if we did really believe it, we ſhould be as ready to truſt to it, where Life or Eſtate were concern'd, as in the ſmalleſt Matters.

P. 5. God in his Allwiſe Diſpenſations, has requir'd from us continual proofs of our dependance upon him, even as to our ſubſiſtence, and the very neceſſaries of our Life.

And concerning the *Israelites*, he ſaith p. 6. And to keep their dependance continually upon God, no more Manna was given than for one Day at once; and command was given to gather no more than the proportion allotted for one Day, which was the full of an Omer, and that none of it ſhould be left until the next day; and when ſome out of good Huſbandry (as they thought) kept of it 'till the next day, it did not profit them, for it bred Worms, and ſtunk,

p. 7. The like abſolute dependance did Chriſt require in his Apoſtles, *Mat. 10. 9.* and has Inſtructed us, as the *Israelites* in their daily Manna, to Pray for no more at once than the Bread of one Day—and to truſt God for the Morrow. And that not for once or twice, as if only for a Trial, but to continue daily and yearly, to ſignifie their (*viz.*) the *Israelites* Abſolute and Eternal dependance on him, and him only.

Obſervation. Then if the Priests of our Times were true Succeſſors to the Apoſtles in the ſame Spirit and Faith, and real Miniſters of the Goſpel of Chriſt, as they were, and did as firmly believe in God

as the Sovereign Disposer of all things in Heaven and Earth, they would be as ready to trust to him on such terms as he has requir'd them in *Matt. 10. 9.* as on the terms of Tythes; but their not so trusting God and depending on him (of which this Essay is one proof) shews their diffidence and unbelief, and that shews them not to be true Gospel Ministers.

The first Inference should be undeniable, if that requiring *Matt. 10. 9.* be yet in force; and if it is not in force, to what purpose doth he instance it here? and for the other, if he'll have it the contrary way, that they do so trust God, and depend on him on such terms as above, let them shew it in Act, and we are agreed about it, but not 'till then; for it is plain such dependence and trusting God, even for the very necessities of Life, and a settled Maintenance by Tythes cannot consist together.

*Eccles. 8.
11.
Ver. 6.*

For let us suppose such trust and dependence as he speaks on, and an *Omer*, a small Measure containing three Pints and half, is as good for a Priest as a Tythe-Barn; and should all the Goods hoarded up there above the quantity of an *Omer*, like *Israel's* Manna, breed Worms and stink, what Magazines of Worms and stink would our Tythe-Barns be! enough to furnish as many Stink-Pots as would poison a Nation. *Snake* may here see whether his comparative Arguments have led him; and *because sentence against an evil work is not always executed speedily; let not therefore the hearts of Men be fully set in them to do evil; for to every purpose there is time and judgment.* Let not Priests or People so eagerly laying up Treasure in the Earth, and gathering into Barns even the fruit of other Mens labour, compare their manner of Living to that of the *Israelites* in the Wilderness, when God fed them with Manna from Heaven; such stuff will not pass with People, who are not to be perswaded that the Priests now are on the same terms for a Maintenance the *Israelites* were then, which was all by Miracle, without any trust to Natural Causes; nor that that was intended for a perpetual maintenance, but only for that time; the Ingenious will see his blind side here, and it is plain he understands not the Scriptures he quotes on this Head.

*Mat. 23. 4.
Luke 11.
26.*

Besides *Sna.* is intangled in a Dilemma; for if he will find out Dependences, and Duties of Faith and Trust for all but the Priests, and exempt them, it will look ill, and render them Successors to the old Hypocrites, who imposed upon the People heavy burthens, and grievous to be born, but would not touch them with one of their fingers, rather than to the Apostles: But if he includes them (*viz.*) the Priests, that God hath required of them continual Proofs of their trust and dependence upon him even for their subsistence, the very necessities of Life.

Then

Then so long as this Trust and Dependence is to continue, so long the Priests ought to have no coercive Power or Law to compell a Maintenance from the People; for such a Power to force the People to pay, is inconsistent with such a dependence, but he saith, this dependence is to be continual; so then the Priests ought never to have a coercive Power or Law, nor could they make any use on't, so long as they abide in this Christian Faith and trust, as in *Mat. 10. 9.*

But as the Priests both have such coercive Power to compell and force Tythes from the People, and often make cruel use on't, and plead for it, it shews their unbelief and Covetousness; and it is plain he understands not one of the three Texts he here instanceth, not so much as that Petition in the Lord's Prayer for daily Bread.

Further, if Covetousness is therefore called Idolatry, because it transfers our trust from God to Mammon, as *Sna.* says in Introduction, p. 2. Then if we will not trust God according as he has requir'd of us in Scripture, and on the terms on which his Apostles and Primitive Ministers trusted him and lacked nothing, but we will have a certain *quantum* compellable by Law, we will have Tythes; is not this a plain demonstration of the transference of our trust from God to Mammon, and so in his own sense Covetousness and Idolatry, and a robbing of God of his great Worship, &c. But the Priests will not trust God on such terms now, so they are measur'd by their own Rule, and found faulty.

Sna. Sect. 3. p. 26, 27. 'Of all the Principalities in Hell there is none like Mammon, therefore God hath from the beginning guarded us with the greatest Caution against this Devil; he has commanded him to be Sacrificed upon his Altar, and made that a part of the Worship of God.

Observation. What a part of the Worship of God to Sacrifice the Devil upon his Altar! when made he it a part of his Worship? in old time they brought *Incense from Sheba, and sweet Cane from a far Country*, *Jer. 5. 20.* and must we now ransack Hell for a Sacrifice? God's Sacrifices were the finest of the Fruits, the goodliest of the Flocks, of a sweet smell and odour, acceptable, and Holy, nothing unclean, or blind, or lame, or blemished; and will the Devil serve now? *the Altar* *Exod. 29.* *was most holy, and whatsoever touched it must be holy; and the Altar sanctified the Gift,* *37.* but when, according to the *Snake's* new System of Sacrifice, the Devil is the Gift, doth the Altar Sanctifie the Gift, or the Gift pollute the Altar, or both remain in *statu quo prius* still? *Matt. 23.* *19.*

2 Kings
23. 16.

the Altar most holy, the gift the Devil : Of old time to burn dead Mens bones upon the Altar polluted it ; but according to Snake, burn the Devil upon it now and it will not pollute it ; or else God hath commanded to have his Altar polluted, and made it a part of his Worship. I delight not in so often repeating the foul Name, but I could not otherwise sufficiently detect this Snake's Insipidness, and what a Jewish Idea of Worship he here expresses by his Altar and Sacrificing, as hereafter he doth an Heathenish one.

“ But we have not done with this Mammon yet, for Snake p. 28. proceeds thus : When we approach to Worship God, we must Sacrifice more or less of our Mammon before him, to shew that we depend upon God for our whole Subsistence, and that Mammon is not that God, but we offer him up as a Sacrifice to another God, to a greater than he.

Observation. Hence it appears Snake makes Mammon a God ; else what mean those words, Mammon is not that God, if he's no God at all ; or those words, we offer him—to another God ; if he's not a God, why is it said another God, a greater than he ; a greater, what's a greater God than he, so he is a God : For the words, he is not that God, and another God, imply more Gods than one, and Mammon to be a God, as the Argument bears.

And now Sna. may come out of his Grass, and outvie Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, or Old *Helmont's* or *Keith's* Transmigrations or Revolutions of Humane Souls, by changing Mammon into as many Shapes as *Proteus* ; for he means it of a God, of a Devil, of our Worldly Substance, of Tythes, of Sacrifice, and what not ; this Learning of the Snake is a rare thing.

Sna. Sect. 4. Some part of our Substance is due to God as an Act of Worship.

Sect. 5. The determinate quantum of a Tenth under the Law, &c.

Sect. 6. Before the Law, shewn in the Instances of *Abraham*, and of *Jacob*.

Observation on Sect. 4. Not this or the other part, but all our Substance, and not only that, but our Lives also, all are Gods, and all due to him, as he shall require them of us ; the Cattle of a thousand Hills are his ; but this proves not that God hath Universally Instituted

Psal. 50.
10.

tuted from the beginning by a perpetual Ordinance the Annual Payment of a Tenth part of our Increase to the Priests, as an Act of Worship, and so is of no Service to the *Snake*, for less than this will not support his Argument.

Sna. Ibid. ' We are not only to Worship God with our Lips, and ' give him Praises with our Tongues, which is but an Inferiour and ' Contemplative Worship, but he has required that we should pay ' him an active Honour, that is, Worship him with our Substance.

This is a necessary part of that Glory which we must give to God, and as much preferable to Verbal Praises, as Deeds are more than Words.

Observat. Sna. leaves us in a Mist here, not having explain'd and ascertain'd what this preferable Worship is, but he saith these words shew it, *viz. Bring an Offering, and come into his Courts, Psal. 96. 8.* We must take these words either Mystically, or Literally; if the former, the Content of this Psalm, according to *Tremellius*, is an Exhortation to the Church, as well Gentiles as Jews, to praise God for his Greatness, for his Kingdom, and for his general Judgment, which is the very Worship *Snake* is undervaluing; but if the latter, we are still to seek from him what the Lord's Courts there mentioned are, and what the Offerings we must bring thither: Will he send us to the Antiquated Places of Worship in the Holy-Land, and revive the whole Jewish Offerings and Sacrifices; this one would be apt to conclude, but that a few Lines below, he owns these Typical Sacrifices to be ceased. From whence it appears he intends it only of Tythes; and from the two Texts he quotes for it, *viz. Prov. 3. 9. Eccles. 35. 8.* which treat of Tythes and First Fruits.

So that now we have found out the *Snake's* main Religion, his highest and chief Worship; in which, until he can make giving and receiving the same thing, the Priests have no share; but it's as much preferable to their Worship as Deeds are more than Words; who are Reverend now? the Laity, Worshippers in Deeds, or the Clergy Worshippers in Words only? See what follows upon his premises, and it were to be wished there were not so much Truth in some on't, tho' he has dropt it unawares.

If Contemplative Worship be Spiritual Worship, it is that our Lord Jesus Christ Instituted at the Well of *Samarita*, near seventeen hundred years since; and whosoever calls that but Inferior Worship, which superseeds all other Worships, and remains to the end of the World, disesteems and undervalues Christ and his Gospel Worship, but Contemplative Worship is Spiritual Worship, for such Contem-
plation

plation is a clear mental seeing and quiet regarding a Divine Object, whereby we have an entrance into the Beatifick Vision, to him unknown, whose dealing is in abstractive Knowledge, but is a stranger to that which is intuitive.

Therefore *Snake* does disesteem and undervalue Christ and his Gospel Worship.

But as Spiritual Worship is not limited to Contemplation only, but exerts it self in Prayer, Praises and Thanksgivings, &c. this also *Snake* calls Inferior Worship, though the Prophets recommended it, and gave it the preference above Legal Sacrifices, even at that time when they were in force.

David saith, my mouth shall praise thee with joyful Lips—and my tongue shall sing aloud of thy Righteousness—I will praise the Name of God with a Song, and magnifie him with Thanksgiving; this also shall please the Lord better than an Ox or Bullock that hath Horns and Hoofs, Psal. 69. 30, 31.

But it pleaseth not the Priests so well as it affords nothing to the Kitchen; give him the Horned Ox, and the Bullock that hath Hoofs.

The Humble shall see this and be glad, but this is not it that makes the Priests heart glad, what's Spiritual Worship to him, give him his Carnal Tythes.

Hosea the Prophet saith, Take with you words, and turn to the Lord, say unto him take away all Iniquity, and receive us graciously, so will we render the Calves of our Lips.

But whatever we render to God, the Priest will have us render unto him the Calves of our Cows, &c.

Paul the Apostle saith, By him therefore let us offer the Sacrifice of Praise to God continually, that is the fruit of our Lips, giving thanks to his Name.

But tho' God have his Thanks and Praises, the Fruit he requires of us, and pronounceth himself glorified by, yet the Priest will not be pleased for all this, unless he have other Fruit from us, viz. The Fruit of our Lands, and Industry, the Fruits of our Labours and wearisome Toil, even that which we earn by the Sweat of our brows. So it is plain these are no Prophets for this Priest, but if a Man shall Prophecy of Tythe-Pigs, and Geese, and Hens, &c. he shall even be a Prophet for the *Snake*.

Who hath yet another effort against Gospel-Worship, as if we did not therein pay God an active Honour; to which it may suffice to oppose *Psal. 50. 23.* Whosoever offereth Praise glorifieth me: And in the Latin it is called Sacrificing Praise, doing Honour unto God, and Thanksgi-

Thanksgiving is called *doing Thanks*. So that in these Duties of Gospel-Worship, we pay God an active Honour, whose pleasure is not in outward Ceremonies, Sacrifices, or Offerings, but in Sincerity and Obedience; to Obey is better than Sacrifice, and to Hearken, than the fat of Rams; I speak not to your Fathers, &c.—concerning Burnt-Offerings and Sacrifices, &c.

Wherefore when he cometh into the World he saith, *Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, but a Body hast thou prepared me: In Burnt-Offerings and Sacrifice, and Offerings for Sin thou hast had no pleasure; then said I, Lo I come, in the Volume of the Book (it is written of me,) to do thy will O God; above when he said, Sacrifice and Offering, and Burnt-offerings, and offering for Sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein (which were offered by the Law) then said he Lo I come to do thy Will O God; he taketh away the first, that he may establish the second, Heb. 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9.*

Then he takes away Tythes which were offered by the Law, which God would not have continue, neither had pleasure therein, as the Scripture testifieth, then how are they the highest Worship, and as much preferable to Verbal Praises as Deeds are more than Words? and true Gospel-Worship made inferior to them, which are taken away with the rest of the Jewish Offerings, and are no Worship at all.

I saw it meet to bear this Scriptural Testimony to the Coming of Christ, and the Worship in Spirit and in Truth Instituted and Established by him against this Judaizing Snake, and all Jews, Infidels, Tythemongers, and such as make a Trade of Religion.

Observat. on Sect. 5. The Institution of Tythes under the Law is granted in this manner. First, The Tythes of every Year, and of Deut. 14. these every one that paid them, and their Household were also to eat their 22, 23, 24. shares in the place which the Lord should choose to place his Name there; 25, 26, 27. and if this place were too far from them, to carry Tythes in their kind; 28, 29. then they might turn it into Money, and carry the Money thither, and bestow it in whatsoever they desired, as Oxen, or Sheep, or Wine, or strong Drink, and eat it there before the Lord, them and their Household, with what Levites they pleas'd, and rejoyce before the Lord. Then for the Tythes of every third Year, it is commanded thou shalt lay it up within thy Gates, and the Levite, and the Stranger, and the Fatherless, and the Widow which are within thy Gates shall come and eat and be satisfied; he was not to carry it to them, they must come and eat it with him, which amounts only to Feasting them at such times with such a share

a share of their Increase; and it was given as well to the Stranger, the Fatherless and Widow, as to the Levite, who had but his share in common with them.

Observat. on Sect. 6. Here *Snake* shews us no Law, Institution, Ordinance or Command for Tythes, nor so much as any Scripture Custom, either general or particular, and if he can prove the Divine Right of Tythes without any of these, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*.

But he brings two particular Instances of *Abraham* and *Jacob*, on occasion of two immergent Occurrences of their Lives, to shew they gave Tythes; *Abraham* to *Melchisedec*, but he received first Bread and Wine for the Refreshment of his weary Army, returning from a sore Battle; here the Kindness was Reciprocal, begun by *Melchisedec*, and as generously return'd by *Abraham*, not to be out-done in Benificence. And *Jacob* Vowed not Tythes, so as to be given to any Priest, but to the Worship of God, as to perform Sacrifice; whereupon he saith signally, *I will offer Tenth*s, so no proof of the Divine Right of Tythes to be drawn from these.

First, Because no Man can draw General and Universal Conclusions from particular Premises.

Secondly, *Abraham* gave Tenth's of the Spoils of War only, which cannot infer a Duty of giving the Priests the Tythe of all our Increase; neither can *Jacob's* Vow do it, it not relating to giving of Tythes to any Priest, but to offering Sacrifice.

Thirdly, *Abraham* and *Jacob* their offering Sacrifice, and giving Tythes freely, as a Vow and return of Thanks to God, shews they were Tythe-givers, but the Modern Priests are Tythe-receivers, and yet pretend to derive to themselves a Title and Right of receiving Tythes from the others, giving of Tythes, a strange Paradox.

Fourthly, And if we grant as *Sna.* Argues, p. 38, 39, &c. That *Abraham* gave Tythes to *Melchisedec*, in the true notion of Tythe, as Tythe, and a Tribute which was due to *Melchisedec*, as he was Priest of the most High God; yet it can no more bring us under the obligation of Tythe, than Sacrifice, nor so much, as they us'd the one more frequently than the other.

And the Reason is this, both Tythes and Sacrifice at the best, were never more than Typical and Figurative Worship, serving only as a Shadow, but was not of the true Gospel Worship, which
is

is another thing, being Spiritual; for God is a Spirit, and they that Jo. 4. 23^d worship him after the Gospel manner, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth; and the Gospel is of an Eternal Nature, and so is called in Scripture the Everlasting Gospel, but Tythes and Sacrifice are Temporals; and so be of what obligation they would be then, which I take to be none at all; before they were commanded under the Law, it is certain they belonged not to the Gospel Dispensation, nor are of the Nature of it; and thus his Sixth Section is wholly enervated.

'Snake Sect. 4. Having pleaded some part of our Substance is due to
'God, as an act of Worship, which in Sect. 5. he determines to a Tenth,
'he puts the Query, whether God has left us wholly at loose to give it
'in what manner we think fit; and he gives the following answers to 29, 30.
'it, (*viz.*) This being a part of God's Worship, it cannot be paid
'after our fancies, but as God hath appointed it.—Acts of direct
'Worship are to be regulated strictly, according to the positive
'Command of God in Scripture, from which we must not depart,
'either to the right hand or the left, neither to add to it, or di-
'minish from it.—In direct Acts of Worship, which are all com-
'manded by Revelation, we are limited precisely to what is so
'revealed.—It, *i. e.* Tythe must be offer'd in such manner and
'method as he has commanded.—And Sect. 10. he quotes *Origen*,
'to prove, that Tythes are due now, as well as then, according
'to the very Letter of the Law, which in this Case is still Obligatory
'to Christians as well as Jews—And that the very Letter of the
'Law must stand for Payment of First Fruits, of Fruits and Cattle.

120,
121.

Observation. We shall not acquiesce in any Man's Sentence contrary to Scripture and Reason, nor be afraid at *Origen's* Name, while we are able to confute his Argument. *Snake* here insists upon the Payment of Tythes and First Fruits, and the manner to be precisely according to the Letter of the Law, as it is commanded in Scripture; wherein he swerves from his Title of Divine Right, from the beginning, and lays hold of the Letter of the Law for his Title; for his Divine Right he pleads to have been ever from the beginning, and quotes the Fathers insisting upon the Right of Tythes under the Law, and downwards to prove the Title which he pretends had its Original from God at the Creation; as if every thing that was Commanded under the Law was Originally from God at the Creation, or was to continue for ever; neither of which holds good, so neither doth his Argument.

Which having premised, I come now to inquire into the true Scripture Method and manner of those Payments, that we may at length find what *Snake* would be at, and whether his Idea of Religion be not more Jewish than Christian.

We find in Scripture there were first and second first Fruits: 1st, They were to bring unto the Priest a Sheaf or Handful, or *Omer*, containing three Pints and half; of the first fruits of Harvest who was to wave it before the Lord, to be accepted for 'em the Morrow after the Sabbath; and there was to be offer'd with it on the same day an he Lamb without blemish of the first year, for a burnt offering; and the meat offering thereof, two tenth deals of fine flour mingled with oyl; and the drink offering thereof of Wine, the fourth part of an *Hin*; the *Hin* is three quarts. 2^d. They were to account from that day, to the day after seven Sabbaths, i. e. fifty days; and then they were to bring two wave Loaves of two tenth deals of fine flower baken with leaven, and there was to be offer'd with the Bread seven Lambs without blemish of the first year, and one young Bullock, and two Rams for a burnt-offering, with their meat-offering and drink-offering, and one Kid of the Goats for a Sin-offering, and two Lambs of the first year for a Peace-offering; and the Priest was to wave them with the bread of the first fruits, for a wave offering before the Lord, with the two Lambs, *Levit.* 23.

There were also first and second Tythes; 1st the Tythe of every year, which was for feasting, not to be eaten any where, but only in the place which the Lord should chuse to place his Name there, at the Feast of In-gathering. 2^d, The Tythe of every third year, which was called the year of Tything, and were to be given to the Levite, the Stranger, the Fatherless and Widow, to be eaten any where in all the Gates of *Israel*.

And it was the manner of both sorts of Tythes to be offer'd as an heave-offering: But the Tythes of the Children of *Israel*, which they offer as an heave offering unto the Lord, I have given the *Levites* to inherit, *Numb.* 18. *Deut.* 14. and at the offering the second first Fruits and Tythes, there was a form of Confession and Prayer to be used by the Persons offering, which may be seen at large in *Deut.* 26.

Now if First Fruits and Tythes be due according to the very Letter of the Law, which he quotes *Origen* to prove, and be to be paid precisely and strictly as himself says, in such manner and method as is commanded in Scripture; then he introduces all these Jewish Offerings, Sacrifices and Ceremonies to be continued amongst us;

us; which amounts to a rejection or denial of the one Offering and Sacrifice of Christ, *whereby he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified* Heb. 10.

Then he has prescribed to us a Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving in this Essay, *pa.* 254. to be used at the payment of Tythes, and a Form of Blessing to be pronounced by the Priests, &c. is this to keep precisely to Scripture Command, and not to depart from it, to the right hand or the left? and as God hath directed a Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving, and Blessing in Scripture to be used on such Occasions, *Deut.* 26. *Numb.* 6. what occasion for the *Snake* to do it here? does he pretend to refine upon God's doings? and can he say he has neither added to it, nor diminish'd from it, but kept exactly and precisely to Scripture Command in this? what contradiction and confusion is here, why might not God's Form have done as well as the Priest's Form, that he need make a new one; but one may guess at his reason for it, because that form of God's appointment in Scripture agrees not to us, or to our Case or Condition, or Tribe, or to any other People or Nation in the whole World; save only to that People and that Nation of *Israel*; which is a clear Demonstration that God intended it not for any other Nation or People but them only.

Further, he makes the Payment of Tythes and First Fruits to be Acts of direct Worship; and all Acts of direct Worship to be commanded by Revelation; and that in all such Acts we are limited precisely to what is so revealed; but we read not in Scripture that the Payment of First Fruits and Tythes were ever commanded by Revelation before the Law; and it is above shewn to what manner and method these Payments were limited in the Law, and with what Ceremonies and Offerings they were annexed; and so we see what this Author would be at, and have a parcel of his Religion laid open before us, it is left to other Judgments, whether it is Jewish or Christian; and if every act of direct Worship were commanded by revelation in the Law, then it is the same under the Gospel; but the Payments of First Fruits and Tythes under the Gospel are never commanded by Revelation, so they are not direct Acts of Gospel-Worship, nor belong to its dispensation——It's being commanded by Revelation under the Law, doth not prove it to belong to the Gospel: for thus we should introduce the whole Law, even every Branch and part of it, all which were so commanded.

But he brings *Origen* to prove the very Letter of the Law in this Case of Tythes, is still obligatory to Christians as well as Jews, and must stand for payment of First Fruits, of Fruits and Cattle; then he has

made a good hand on't, to shift his Title of Divine Right from the Beginning, for this of the Jewish Law.—He implicitly grants the letter of the Law doth not in all Cases oblige us, as well as the Jews, but only in this Case of Tythes; and why in it, more than any other, let him shew reason; and if he prove it, he obligeth us to Annual Wave-Offerings, Heave-Offerings, Burnt-Offerings, Meat-Offerings, Drink-Offerings, Sin-Offerings, Peace Offerings, and to a Form of Thanksgiving and Prayer Recorded in the Law, not his Form Recorded in the Essay; because it is not strictly according to the positive command of God in Scripture, but after his own fancy, not as God hath appointed it.

Snake Sect. 7. p. 53. 'Pleads, that it was the Universal Notion and Tradition of the Gentile World, that Tythes were due unto some God or other, which they paid accordingly, &c. which Notion or Tradition he would have admitted, as a Testimony to the Divine Right of Tythes.

Observation. The Notions, Traditions and Practices of the Gentiles Superstitions, Ceremonies and Idolatry, (among which were Tythes and Sacrifices) can be no Testimony among Christians to their Divine Right; for this would change Christianity into Gentilism or Paganism, would introduce all Heathenish Rites and Worship, and plunge us into Polytheism; for the Notion consists of two Parts: First, Tythes due; Second, to some God or other, which infers a Plurality of Gods, and is Blasphemy.

The Heathen's Notion [of Sacrifice being due unto some God or other, was as general and current among them, as their Notion of Tythes being so due; which no more proves the Divine Right of Tythes, than the Divine Right of their Sacrifices, or the Deity of their Idol Gods; but shews as if Tythes had been originally the maintenance of Idolatrous Priests and Temples, and dedicated and vowed to Idols, and the supporting Idolatry; which is no Argument for their Divine Right, any more than for the Divinity of Idolatry.

Then it is to be Noted, the *Snake* all along in this Section allows more than becomes him to the Heathens Idol-Gods, Priests, Sacrifices, Feasts and Customs. To their insensible God to require Tythes, know when they are with-held, be offended and pleased: To their Priests to know when their Idol Gods are offended, by the Marks and Observations they made of their Sacrifices; to their Sacrifices for exhibiting such notice; to their Feasts in resembling them to

to those under the Law; to their Customs in instancing the Whore *Rhodopis*, with the Epithet Conscientious. An Epithet is a word added to a Noun Substantive, to express some quality of it; as a Noble Person; here Noble is the Epithet expressing the quality of the Person; and so in the Instance before us. *Rhodopis* that conscientious Whore; here he makes conscientious the Epithet to express the quality of a Whore. I have insisted upon it, that all People may see the prophaneness of this Author, to ascribe such a Vertuous Character to a Whore; because she sent to *Delphi* as many Spits for use in Sacrifice, as the Tythe of that gain which she made of her Body came to. But this, saith *Snake*, shews the notion they had of all Increase paying Tythes. But is every Notion of the Heathens a Precedent to Christians, or had they all their Notions from God? (or this one) who hath expressly forbid to bring *the hire of a Whore* Deut. 2 into his House, for any Vow it is abominable; if this would serve among 18. the Gentiles, the Jews were forbid it, and to do after their manner; so how disingenious is it to bring such an instance; and how should the *Quakers* or any body else be able to dispute with him who attempts such Wonders in Argument, as to prove the Divine Right of Tythes from the Hire of a Whore.

And *Snake* does not only lean to their Notions and Customs, but he prefers the Heathens before Christians, for he makes Tythes the highest and greatest Worship; and now he saith there remains more footsteps thereof among them, than in many parts of Christendom.

So to conclude this Head, be Heathens, be Whores, be what we will, let us pay but Tythes, and we are according to *Snake* conscientious, and the greatest and chief Worshipers of God.

Innocui omnes cultores. Numinis omnes.

Snake Sect. 8. page 84, 85. 'Its now time to see how far upward we can trace the Practice of Tythes, that (if possible) we may find its beginning. — *Melchisedec* is the first, of whom express mention is made that he received Tythes; he is the first likewise whom we read of called by the Name Priest.

Observation. One would think he had here found out the beginning of Tythes, and were come to the end of his trace; for as he owns this to be the first express mention we have of Tythes, the first we read of, &c. how can he trace them higher; he denies Revelation, and if he goes upon implication or conjecture, it will scarce be allowed him.

Notes.

Note, *Snake* pretends here to be tracing the practice of Tythes; and produceth only one Act of *Abraham's*, which proves no practice, for practice is a thing that is often repeated, it cannot properly be called a Man's Practice, which he doth but once in his Life time; besides Practice here is to be understood of an Universal Practice and Law, Divinely enjoined, and descended through all Ages, and Generations of Men, *page 105.* all which *Snake* foolishly pretends to have shewn.

But can all this be infer'd from *Abraham's* Gift, or *Jacob's* Vow of Tenth; if not, he performs nothing here, for he proves no particular, much less an Universal practice of Tythes thus high; and yet to prove them higher, he thus proceeds: *None doubts but that there were Priests before Melchisedec, who was without beginning of days; so if there were Priests before him, it is like it was a great while ago.*

But I do not believe, nor many others, that there were Tythe-receiving-Priests among *Abraham's* Predecessors before *Melchisedec*; for first, any one (in a sense) was his own Priest, and offer'd for himself, as in the instances of *Cain*, *Abel*, *Noah*, and so downward; then the Priesthood was in the First-born, and they offer'd the first General Sacrifice that we read of, after the *Israelites* came out of *Egypt*; then God took the Tribe of *Levi* in lieu of the First-born, and when the Priesthood was settled in them, Tythes were given for their maintenance, but 'till then there was no such thing.

Switch,
407.

Which Truth is put beyond Controversie, by so many Directions and Precepts given about Tythes in their Institution under the Law; for if *Abraham* and *Melchisedec* both learned the practice of Tythes from their Fathers, as *Snake* affirms *p. 102.* then what need of so many Precepts, and all this Direction now? and who was *Melchisedec's* Father? of whom the Apostle saith, *he was without Father, without Mother*; and *Snake* saith he learn'd the practice of Tythes from his Father.

Upon this none doubts it, and a mis-translation of *Gen. 4. 7.* by the *Septuagint*, quite differing from the Text as we have it, he pretends to prove the practice of Tythes as high as *Cain*.

Observation. But besides the weakness of his none doubts it, and slight of Scripture for a Comment; he is here upon his former Error, endeavouring in vain, from one single Action to prove a Practice, and an Universal Practice too; thus if *Cain's* Offering had been paying Tythes to a Priest, but there's no ground for that; for if it at all respected Tythes, as it did not, then it must mean offering them

them to God, not paying them to a Priest; for he was his own Priest, and offer'd his Offering himself.

Snake still proceeds, and will needs have Tythes as old as Marriage.

Observation. Marriage we read in Scripture, was Instituted in Paradise, but nothing of Tythes there 'till after the Fall, after the Flood, after the Apostacy, from the innocency and simplicity of the *Noachichal* Principles, for about Ten Generations from *Noah* to *Abraham*; in which time the Earth was replenished, and the Nations divided; and concerning which, it is observ'd by *Augustin*, 'That no Family was found living now to God. So much of the first Scripture mention of Tythes before their introduction under the Law, and Tythes and Sacrifices were never introduced under the Gospel, 'till after another as long an Apostacy from the simplicity and purity of the true Evangelical Principles, when they were both brought in at the General Council of *Lateran*, Anno 1200. and with them, the *Pope's* Power over Kings.

Snake Sect. 8. page 102. 'That Instance of *Abraham's* paying Tythe to *Melchisedec* the Priest, was told only occasionally, not as the Original of Tythes, or of Priesthood, more than his paying current Money with the Merchant to *Ephron* (*Gen.* 23. 16.) was the Original of Money or Merchandize, because we never read of Money, or of Merchants before.

Observation. Here he tells us we never read of Money before *Gen.* 23. 16. and yet in *Gen.* 17. we read of Money four several times; and even in this 23^d Chapter of *Genesis*, we read of Money twice before we come to the 16th Verse; how could his acuteness over-see this?

But further, as to *Melchisedec's* being the first of whom mention is made that he received Tythes, and first whom we read of called Priest.

Observation. This is not only the first, but both the first and the last mention we have of Tythes in all the Scripture, until their Institution under the Law. And *Melchisedec* is not only the first whom we read of called by the Name of Priest (but set aside the Princes of *Egypt* and *Midian*, who were also called Priests) and he is both the first and the last called by that Name in all the Scripture, until the coming of *Israel* to Mount *Sinai*, where they received the Law, and the Institution of Priesthood and Tythes.

But

But *Snake* pretends to prove that there were Priests from the beginning, and Tythes paid them so long.

Observation. In order to Clear this Point, it behoves first to settle a Notion of the word Priest; for we do not deny the goodness and Grace of God to all those Ages of the World, and that he raised up among them some Holy and Spiritual Men and Prophets; but it cannot be of Spiritual Priests and Worship *Snake* intends it, but of Legal or Carnal and Typical Priests and Worship, as is plain from their Office, Sacrifice and Tythes, all which are Carnal and Typical; their Office to offer Sacrifice for others, and to receive of them Tythes as their reward for this Service; but those Ages in which every Man offer'd his own Sacrifice, were strangers to such a Priesthood, and in which we cannot find one single Instance of any one's offering Sacrifice for others, (*ex Officio* as their Priest) nor not so much as the bare mention of either Priest (save as above) or Tythe, 'till *Abraham's* time, in the Year of the World, 2092. and after this never mentioned again for 421 Years after, when *Israel* came to *Mount-Sinai* where God first instituted the legal Priesthood and Tythes.

Sure *Snake* must needs think he has to do with a credulous Generation, that would persuade us that the Institution of a carnal typical Priesthood, and of Tythes for their Maintenance have been from the beginning; when as there is no mention in Scripture of either Priest or Tythe, but once for the space of 2513 Years, this is a Contempt of Scripture; but those Holy Writings have not been so silent concerning God's Dispensations to Mankind: But if it had been so among God's People, we should have had an Account of the Tribe, Families and Names of such Priests; and the manner of their Consecration and Office, and their Succession, as it is in the case of the Levitical Priesthood, touching which, the Scripture is full and express concerning their Tribe, Families, Names, Consecration, Offices, Succession, &c. And concerning Tythes, the Scripture is full and express as to the Quantum, the Species, the Time, Places and manner of Payment, and to whom, &c. the which, if Priesthood and Tythe had been so well known before, as he pretends, had been superfluous.

Snake Sect. 8. page 104. ' To Sacrifice was the Offices of the Priest, and the Tythe was his Reward; so that these being Relatives must be of equal standing.

Observ.

Observation. Then they must be of equal beginning and ending, must begin and end together, for this is a General Rule of Relatives, if the one be, the other must needs be; if the one be taken away, the other must also be taken away; then if *Sacrifices of the Fruit of the Ground, and of the firstlings of the Flock, and of the Fat thereof* Gen. 4. be taken away, Tythes are also taken away: But he pleads the continuance of Tythes upon the foot of Divine Right, which infers the continuance of Sacrifices, of the fruit of the Ground, and of the firstlings of the Flock, and of the fat thereof, upon the same foot. Either this Author's oldest imaginary Priesthood ended before the Institution of the Levitical Priesthood, or there were two Tythe-receiving Priesthoods in force at once; of the one whereof there remains footsteps enough, but the other is altogether chimerical, having no real footsteps of it remaining in Scripture. If the latter, then they should have different Provinces, or distinct Jurisdictions, or otherwise the People would be double Tythed. If the former, then Tythes the great Appendix and Relative (as he makes it) of that antiquated Priesthood must surely be ended with it, then down goes his Divine Right of Tythes, and all his Arguments are void, and sink with it, that are before the Law of *Moses*.

Snake Sect. 7. page 84. 'There is no account how it, *i. e.* Tythe began among the Gentiles; it was time out of mind with them, as antient as any thing which their Histories contain'd.—' Q. 1. Let us next enquire who it was that enjoyn'd it, and that must be either *Adam*, or *God* immediately.—Q. 2. And it cannot be imagined that *Adam* should make such a standing and Universal Law without directions from God; for such we must suppose all the Laws which *Adam* gave, to be.

Observation. If so, then Tythes among the Gentiles, which was a part of their Worship, was not a bare Notion and Tradition, as in *Snake's* last Section, but a standing and Universal Law Divinely enjoyn'd; but this could not be, because as is noted on the last Section, their Tradition consisted of two Parts: 1. Tythe due: 2. To some God or other; which last contains Polytheism, and is Blasphemy, so could not be from God; and then it will follow, the Gentiles had not their Tything from him: But that Tythes and many Gods were at first concomitant Notions, and Tythes originally the maintenance of the false Idolatrous Priests and

and Worshippers of the many false Gods, but never the maintenance of the true Priests, and Worshippers of the one true God, but during the time of the Law only.

Further, if the Gentiles had their Tythes from God immediately, or by *Adam*, then God did Institute some part of the Gentiles Idolatrous Religion and Worship; and gave the same Portion unto the Priests of the Gentiles for their Service at the Altar and Temples of Idols, as under the Law he gave to his own Priests and Levites for their Service, at his own Altar, Tabernacle and Temple; and that the Idol-Altars and Altars of God, he endued with the same Revenue, or he gave more to the first.

I shall not trace this Author thorow the various Meanders of his Argument, whereby he argues to prove the Divine of Tythes, from a pretended universal Reception and Antiquity among the Gentiles; but if this be firm and conclusive, then Polytheism and Sacrifice (being of as great Antiquity and universal Reception among them as Tythes) must be as Sacred as they; the Gentiles have not had an universal Notion and Tradition all along of one God; but is that any Argument against it? Again, They have had all along an universal Notion and Tradition of many Gods; is this any Argument for it? let him have a care of Blasphemy, for if it be an Argument for the one, it is an Argument against the other. And if (as he pleads) God enjoined the payment of Tythes to that Idolatrous Priesthood of the Gentiles, then it shews his approvement of that Priesthood and Worship; thus at this rate he may sanctifie and legitimate the whole bulk of the Gentiles Idolatrous Religion and Worship, and give it all a Divine Original, and Holy Law for its Sanction.

An

An ESSAY upon the Rise of Tythes, in a Short Digression.

HAVING past through this tracing Section, before I proceed any further, it's now time to see how far upwards we can find Tythe; that we may find its beginning, and from whence it sprang, and from thence may judge how little it concerns us, and how remote it is from any Divine Right, saving only as it hath run through the vein of the *Mosaical* Institutions, as was consecrated and warmed as it were there for a time, during its Passage, as some other things were; in doing of which, I shall not follow *Snake's* ramble into the first Age of the World, which is silent as to any such thing, but shall begin with the beginning of the second Age, extending from *Noah* to *Abraham*, which was a time of great Apostacy and Corruption, as has been noted by the Ancients. *Luther* on *Gen. 14.* saith, *Melchisedec* by the common Opinion of the *Hebrews* is concluded to be *Sem*, who died not long before *Jacob* went into *Egypt*; whereto he assents, and saith, the World was so degenerated in so short a time; horrible to think, that he was contemned, whom yet *Abraham* Honoured as God's Priest!

And from *Noah* to *Abraham*, even for ten Generations, in which the Earth was replenished, and the Nations divided; it is by *Augustine* observed, *lib. 16. cap. 1.* *That no Family was found living now to God*; sure a very great Apostacy: And *L. Herbert* saith, *Abraham* had an Example of his Forefathers, who worshipped strange Gods, after the Ceremonies which the Priests had devised the multiplicity of, in their declining from the simplicity of the *Noachical* Principles.

Now it appears, that in this dark time of Apostacy and Idolatry, Tythes came in, or had their first Rise; whose Superstition, according to *Epiphanius*, *adv. Heres. lib. 2. p. 9.* was from *Serug's* time, great Grandfather to *Abraham*, who paid Tythes, and passed from *Egypt* into *Greece*, by *Inachus*.

So it seems that Tythes have issued at first from the Heathens, there being so many Monuments of them amongst them, as in Instances thereof, *Selden* writes a whole Chapter of *Un Pages*, but yet does not bring one, of their receiving them from the Jews.

Epiphanius and the Scriptures date Heathenish Superstition ancienter than *Abraham's* Tythes and Swearing; for the Scriptures say, *your Fathers lived beyond the flood, and served other Gods*, *Josh. 24. 2. Jud. 14. 5, 6, 7.*

And *Snake* himself says, 'other Nations were in the possession of Tythes, long before the Law of *Moses*. All these Instances shew them to be first among the Heathens.

Herbert Baron of Cherbury, writing of their Religion, saith; 'That their Priests drew them first, for their Covetousness, from the true simple fundamental *Noachical* Principles, into sundry Observations and Superstitions.

In this little short Survey we may see, about what time Tythes came in, in the second Age of the World, and amongst what People they took their first Rise, and by whose means, *i. e.* of the Heathen-Priests for their Covetousness. So the Covetousness of Priests it seems, first introduc'd them, and the Covetousness of Priests is the great cause of their continuance; and their Rise was from the Heathens, in a time of a great and general Apostacy, which lasted about ten Generations; and it must needs be the *Hebrews* first learned Tything of them.

Considering the general Apostacy which was then in the World, the *Hebrews* at their calling out of it (no question) retain'd some things sprung up therein, which they had learned and were nursed up in, and among the rest Tythes; which is further confirm'd, seeing *Abraham* was called out from amongst Idolaters, who Worshiped strange Gods, as the Scripture saith, and as appears also by *Rachel's* Stealing her Father's *Teraphims*, and *Jacob's* Burying them under an Oak, such as they afterwards Worshiped, after they were come out of *Egypt*, where they also learned to Worship a Calf.

And tho' the Apostle decides it that *Abraham* gave Tythes to *Melchisedec*, yet he doth not decide it under what notion he gave them, whether as to King, or Priest, or both: But grant it was to the Priest of the most High God, the Patriarchs named him after the manner of the Heathen, *Elohim* in the Plural Number; so great was the Apostacy of those times, and the Opinion of many Gods

Gods so generally received, that they named not God as one, but as many; and it seems that as they named him after the manner of the Heathen, so they served him after their manner in their Ceremonies, with their Sacrifices, Altars and High Places, and Groves, winked at for a time, which were afterwards some allowed or commanded, some not.

Then the Heathen Temples were first, for we read of Temples among them, before any among the Jews; and we may with as good reason suppose that the *Hebrews* received their Tythes from the Gentiles, which are a principal Appendix to their Temples, as that they received Temples from them; and that as probably as they received Cities.

But *Snake* has had the foresight to block up the way as much as he can, by a parcel of trivial Arguments, whereby he would insinuate, that neither the Jews learned it from the Gentiles, nor them from the Jews; all which hang upon their having such an Antipathy or aversion to one another, that neither would learn the others Customs; plainly contrary to matter of Fact, as it is Recorded in Scripture; where we read much of the *Israelites* going a Whoring after the Customs of the Heathen Gentiles, notwithstanding the great restraint laid upon them by the Law to the contrary; see *Ezek.* 23. 3.

But *Snake* still further attempts to fright us from this way by a Blasphemous Consequence of his own stupid fabrication he would put upon it (*viz.*) 'That it overthrows the whole Foundation of our Religion, giving it no higher a rise than the Imaginations of Wicked Men, and instead of the Devil's Apeing of God in his Institutions, this by a Blasphemous Inversion makes God to Ape the Devil, and borrow from him the whole Oeconomy of his Worship and Religion.'

Observat. The Poison of Asps is under his Tongue. Are Typical Sacrifices the whole Foundation of our Religion? or are Tythes the whole Oeconomy of God's Worship and Religion? it seems it's the whole that he looks at, but we shall destroy his Conclusion by Scripture; *Cain* was the first we read of that brought an outward Offering, thinking God to be such an one as himself, to be pleased with such things, contrary to *Psal.* 50. he was the Archtype of the Earthly City, and like *Romulus*, the Founder of *Rome*, slew his Brother; he introduced Offerings and Man-slaughter, and yet Offerings were afterwards allowed to the *Israelites*.

Oaths,

Gen. 21. Oaths, as appears from Scripture, were first among the Heathens ; for *Abimelech* first urged *Abraham* to Swear, and *Laban* the Idolator, *Jacob* : But afterwards Oaths were allowed to the *Israelites*, and made a part of their Law.

Exod. 22. 11. Numb. 5. 19. 1 Sam. 8. Kings were first among the Heathens a long time, but at length the *Israelites* came to the Prophet *Samuel*, saying, *Now make us a King to Judge us like all the Nations—we will have a King over us, that we also may be like all the Nations* ; and tho' this wilful Demand seemed as a rejecting and forsaking God, and they were induced into it by the manner of other Nations, and earnest to be like all the Nations ; yet so great was the ever to be admired condescension of God unto that People, that he gave them a King, and a long Succession of Kings 'till the Coming of Christ ; also there is no doubt but many things among the Jews were by permission ; and so *Augustin* from *Psal. 50.* accounts Offerings, of which Tythes are a part, seeing by Christ's own Interpretation, some things concerning the Commands in the Decalogue it self, which they conclude an iteration of the Moral Law written in the heart from the beginning, namely, the Seventh Commandment, to be permitted about Divorce, which Christ saith from the beginning it was not so ; but permitted the Jews for the hardness of their hearts.

And as certain it is, that Marrying many Wives, which was connived at, or permitted to the Fathers, was not from the beginning, as Christ said, when God Created them Male and Female.

Some of these Instances shew that some things were permitted to the *Israelites*, and not only so, but some things which they learned of the Heathens were afterwards permitted to them ; and if we may conclude with the Scripture, in which there should be no danger one would think, of this sort were Arbitrary Kings, and Tythes, the latter signifying the Dominion of the former ; which as *Samuel* told the Jews the Kings of the Nations used to exact, which was of their best, as the Heathens did in their *Premessum & Caspar*, the chief of their Corn and Wine, *J. Seld. p. 7.*

And the *Snake* cannot disprove these Instances, nor do they support the Blasphemous Consequences he seeks to put upon them, of God's Aping the Devil, and borrowing from him the whole Oeconomy of his Worship and Religion, which consists not in these things, as the *Snake* makes it ; whose wild Principles that lie scatter'd here and there in this little Book, if duly Collected,

would

would make up such a bulk of Heresie, as we have yet no single Name for.

But as we have already the *Snake's* Evil Sentiments on this Head, so I shall proceed to give the good and wise Sentiments of Better and Learned Men than he upon it.

The Jews had a Law, a Law of Children are brought off Customs, by degrees which they learn of others; as if he should say, if you will have the Nations manner, you shall have it at my appointment, not by their own or others wild Wills and Imaginations, but under a Law and restraint of Obedience, as in their King; they must have the manner of it written: If the State of Man require something outward and passing through the Senses, that may mediate and prepare a passage between God and him, it must not be of his own Invention and Wisdom, but of the Wisdom of God revealed to him more outwardly, or more inwardly. Yea, sometimes things that Men have abused to their Vanities and Superstition, God converts to his own and his Servants Service, as the *Egyptians* and *Canaanites* Spoil, but not in their time and way, but his own.

May we not conclude probably, that some things received in by connivance, and regulated, and receiving God's permission for them, remained Signal or Typical for a time, and after ceased; and let him bring in an Example, that after they ceased, they were ever taken up again and approved by God.

Euthymius Zagabonus a Father, doth plainly affirm in his Comment on *Math. 5.* joyning Sacrifices (of which Tythes are a part) with Swearing, saith he:

' But if an Oath be of the Devil, how did the old Law permit it?

Answer. Because the Sacrifices of Living Creatures were also of Evil, and by the deceit of Idols, yet the Law permitted them, because of the infirmity of the *Hebrews*; for whereas they were Gluttons and Smell Feasts, they loved the Sacrifices of Idols; and whereas also they were unbelieving, they also loved an Oath; and that they should not afterwards either Sacrifice to Idols, or Swear by Idols, the Law permitted them to Sacrifice and to Swear; and if there be any else of that kind, they transferred all unto God. * Now it came to pass in process of time he would cut off these things also, by a more sublime Law to be brought in; because it is good for Infants to be Suckled, but to
Men

* In process of time they began, in process of time they ended.

Men it is very unfit. There we allow this to them that live after the manner of Infants, but we withdraw or prohibit them that are Manly from it: So he; this is his Judgment and Assertion concerning Oaths and Sacrifice, and any thing of that kind.

(Tythes are of that kind, which *Snake* says are Relatives to Sacrifices) and not only his, but the Judgment of many other Scripture Interpreters; see *Jerom* on *Mat. 5.* *Oecumenia* on *James 5.* *Rabanus* and *Lyrn* on *Jer. 7.* and *Isa. 66.* *Thomas Aquinas* on *Math. 5.*

Chrysostom also to the same purpose.

It's true, God did condescend to give the *Israelites* a Temporal Command for Tythes, as suiting that Polity, but not as a Law Natural, Moral or Perpetual, nor that the Priests should forcibly exact them; and it is noted above, they were permitted, because of the infirmity of the *Hebrews*, of which *Abraham's* Stock was, before the Name of *Israel* was given, which all of them offered Sacrifices as *Job* did, who was of that Family. So they appear to have sprung up in the Second Age of the World, before *Abraham's* time, in that great and general Apostacy, wherein the Covetousness of the Heathen Priests invented a multitude of Ceremonies, amongst which they must be ranked.

And here I shall end this small ESSAY, and proceed to some further Observations on the *Snake*.

106. *Snake* Sect. 9. ' This (that is the *Mosaical* Law) does not, or
' ever did oblige any other Nation. But all the rest of the *Le-*
' *vitical* Law, except the Typical, the Ceremonial and the Juda-
' *ical*, were confirmed by Christ, and needed no new Injunction.

107. It (that is Tythes) was long before the Law, and therefore
not taking its rise from the Law, could not be abrogated in the
Law.

It (that is Tythes) was a part of the Law, as being a new
enjoined in the Law, and so was a Municipal or Judaical Law
among the *Jews*.

108. But it (that is Tythes) does not therefore cease to oblige
other Nations, as other parts of their Judaical Law may cease.

The abrogation of the Law of *Moses*, had it been every word
abrogated, could not have dissolved the obligation of Tythes.

Tythes

Tythes belonging to no part of it (that is of the Law) that ceased upon the Coming of Christ, consequently is still confirm'd, unless it can be shewn that Christ has discharg'd it.

Observat. Snake says that Tythes was a Municipal or Judicial Law among the Jews.

And that that Judicial Law does not, nor ever did oblige any other Nation.

But Tythes ceases not to oblige other Nations.

Or thus, Tythes cease not to oblige other Nations.

And Tythes was a Judicial Law among the Jews, but their Judicial Law does not nor ever did oblige any other Nation.

Again *Snake* says, all the rest of the Law (except the Typical, the Ceremonial, and the Judicial) were confirmed by Christ, then these were not confirmed by him, and them that were not Confirmed by him, needed a new Injunction, but it would not need a new Injunction, if it were not first ceased; therefore Tythes being excepted out of Christ's Confirmation are ceased. Or thus, says *Snake*, Tythes belonged to no part of the Law that ceased upon the Coming of Christ, but the Judicial Law was not confirmed by Christ, and Tythes belonged to the Judicial Law; and there was no part of the Law but was either confirmed or ended by Christ; but Tythes was not confirmed, therefore was ended by him.

Then *Snake* says, Tythes was a part of the Law, as being anew enjoined in the Law. And Tythes was long before the Law, and took not its rise from the Law.

But the abrogation of the Law, had it been every word abrogated, could not have dissolved the obligation of Tythes.

Could Tythes be a part of the Law, and the whole Law abrogated every word of it, and not Tythes abrogated? or could Tythes be a new enjoined in the Law in abundance of Words and Sentences, and all the Law every word of it abrogated, and yet none of these words that contained the injunction of Tythes abrogated, or the obligation of them dissolved? and what had that part of the Law its rise from, which had not its rise from the Law? and whether was Tythes a part of the Law, long before the Law was in being or not? if not, what were they then?

The Judicial Law does not, nor ever did oblige any other Nation than the Jews. But the Law of Tythes was the Judicial Law.

Law. Therefore the Law of Tythes does not, nor ever did oblige any other Nation than the Jews. And he must either allow this Conclusion, or deny his own premises, which he will, it is left to his Choice.

Snake, page 108. ' But Christ has not only (by his not forbidding) confirmed Tythes, but has given express approbation of them, *Matth. 23. 23.* where he says, these things (*i. e.*) paying of Tythes of the smallest things, as Mint, Anise, and Cummin) ye ought to have done; and in his Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, *Luke 18. 12.* he reckons paying Tythes of all that we possess, as an Act of Worship and Devotion to God; which sure he would not have done if it had been then abrogated. But if you say, that this was spoke to the Pharisees, not to his Disciples. *Origen* who put this Objection, gives an Answer; That he would not have commanded that to the Pharisees, which he would not have his Disciples to fulfill much more abundantly; *for except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, &c.* how therefore (says *Origen*) does my righteousness exceed theirs, if they dare not taste of the Fruits of the Earth, 'till they have first offered the first Fruits to the Priests, and Tythes to the Levites; and I doing none of these things, mispend of the Fruits of the Earth to mine own use, without acquainting Priest or Levite, or letting the Altar partake of any part of them; and this we have said (continues he) to shew, that the Command for first Fruit of Fruits and Cattle, ought to stand even according to the Letter.

Observat. The Solution of this depends upon this single Question, whether they ought to have paid Tythes under the Law, which no body ever questioned that I know of; but it does not therefore follow, that we ought to pay them under the Gospel; nor does Christ's approbation of them to the Pharisees under the Law, infer his approbation of them to his Disciples under the Gospel; for many things concerned them, that concern not us, as Circumcision, &c. and as to our righteousness exceeding theirs, does not Spiritual Righteousness, which is of the Gospel, exceed Legal Righteousness, or that which is of the Law? does not the Righteousness of Faith and Charity the Pharisees omitted, exceed the Righteousness of Tythes they performed? Nor was the

the intent of the Parable, *Luke 18. 12.* to commend the Pharisees Worship and Devotion to God, as *Snake* mistakes it.

So there is so little in this Argument that I thought to have wav'd it; but he seems to make some great matter on't, and brings in *Origen* to his aid, and useth School-craft to puzzle his Reader; for when he thought it served his turn in *pa. 39.* on *Heb. 7. 6.* he said the word is observable *Δεδεκάτωκε*, that is, *Melchizedec* Tythed *Abraham*, i. e. put him under Tythe, or exacted it from him as his due: This is his Comment upon it, tho' in *Gen. 14. 20.* our English Translation, and the Latin renders it, *Abraham gave him Tythes of all*; and in *Heb. 7. 4.* it is in both Latin and Greek, *that he gave him the tenths of the Spoils*; so both places express it as gift, but *Snake*, that *Melchisedec* put him under Tythe, or exacted it from him as his due—But if it was his due, it was *Abraham's* duty to pay it; and that he did it not voluntarily 'till it was exacted of him, signifies the Patriarch's delinquency in paying his due Debt, 'till it was exacted of him; but how it was exacted, whether by Force or Law we are to seek; the Reader may judge of this Comment by the Consequences of it, as he may quickly do of his School-craft; who having now another shift to play, he quotes *Mat. 23. 23.* according to the English Translation, i. e. *Ye pay Tythe, &c.* leaving out *Luke 11. 42.* where the same word is translated, *Ye Tythe, &c.* And above he says, the word is observable *Δεδεκάτωκε*, and he makes it signifie to put one under Tythe, or to exact Tythe of one; and here *ἀποδεκτέ*, he translates, *Ye pay Tythe*, tho' this word be compounded of the same Verb as the other, and the Preposition *ἀπο*, and signifies as well to receive as to give Tythes, and are used in both these Texts, *Mat. 23. 23. Luke 11. 42.* which are to be consider'd as one, as both are declarative of the same Doctrine, and both hinge upon the same Greek Verb, and ought to have the same Translation in both places; but the Priests love better to rub upon the People's Duty, than to touch their own; in which, some worthy Interpreters have not followed their track, As

Beza, who thus Paraphrazeth on the same Place; ye Tythe, ye decide determine or conclude that a Tenth is to be paid by the Law of God, by this they that were Covetous determined for themselves.

Whose Judgment is their spoken of, not their Practice, in paying but in receiving Tythes, to which Interpretation the opposition

tion fitly Answers; ye pass over Judgment, which *Beza* notes to be just and equal, the Precepts of the Second Table, to love thy Neighbour; which devouring Widows Houses, and Tything their Herbs did not answer; and they were of the Tribe of *Levi*, who Tythed such poor Widows as had little but a few Herbs to live on; just like the Priests now, taking from poor Widows a Hen, or a few Eggs, or a Groat in lieu of a Hen once a year, of such poor Creatures as have not above a Hen or two in all the World. And,

Erasmus on the Place taxes their inequality, as if the *Levites* only were regarded of God, or care were only to be had of them; they did their own business under pretence of Religion, Tything Mint, &c. what belongs to your profit (as he Paraphrazes) you superstitiously regard, what to help your Neighbour you neglect; these things which God commanded for a time to be kept according to the Flesh, ye ought not to omit, but these things which God would have to be done as perpetually good and acceptable to him, ought first of all to be performed. We here see of what sort of things *Erasmus* reckons Tythes, not of such as are perpetually good and acceptable to God, but such as were only commanded for a time to be kept, according to the Flesh. Pharisaical Ceremonies (saith he on the same place) which consist in Corporeal things, of which sort are Tythes, have this property to beget finding fault, evil Suspicions, perverse Judgments, Dissention, Hatred and Strife, the special plague of Gospel Godliness, which consists not in such things as is declared in the Common-Prayer-Book concerning them; saying Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law, but it is a Religion to serve God, not in bondage of the Figure or Shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit. And

Augustin complained that Ceremonies were grown to such a number, that the Estate of Christian People was in worse case concerning that matter, than were the Jews; and *Alchwin* calls them the yoke of Tythes.

Gaudanus says thus, as concerning that Saying of Christ in the Gospel; although it be writ in the Gospel, yet Christ spake not that for the time of the Gospel, but for the time of the Law of *Moses*, wherein Ceremonials did not yet cease; and therefore as yet, at that time by the Law of *Moses*, that quota or certain part, as to the number was to be paid, because Christ said to them under the Law, *except your righteousness exceed the righteousness*

ness, &c. and those things ought you to have done, &c. does it therefore extend to us under the Gospel? if so, as Christ said to the Man cleansed of the Leprosie, *Go shew thy self to the Priest and offer the Gift that Moses commanded for a Testimony unto them*, that was, Sacrifice; and Paul offer'd Sacrifice with the Man in the Temple, or was to do, by Advice of the Church; this must also concern us, and we must do it.

Snake, Sect. 9. p. 110. on Heb. 7, 8. 'Under the Law Men that die receive Tythes; but opposing to this that *Melchisedec* Priesthood, which was but a Type of Christs, he saith, that he receiveth them of whom it is witnessed that he liveth, i. e. liveth for ever.—And this was spoken only of Christ; and the Apostle saith, that he receiveth Tythes, then he has not abrogated them, and himself ever living now in Heaven to receive them.

Observat. *Snake* goes upon these words in ver. 8. 'till he is entangled in great confusion, and contradiction, not understanding the Apostles Mysteries Figurative manner of expression in this 8th verse, as in verse the 3d, and as that to be understood, where he speaks of the Type, beyond what any Type can bear, speaks of it under or according to the Properties of the Antitype, or he applies what he speaks unto the thing typified, the Eternity of Christ. And *Snake* finding Eternity or Immortality implied in this verse, takes it in a proper sense, to intend Christ to be the Tythe-receiver literally; not considering that in verse 3. there is Immortality and Eternity ascribed to *Melchisedec*; was he therefore Christ? or was it strictly and properly ascribed to him, or only figuratively, as he was a Type of Christ? and these two verses, the 3d and the 8th, are to be understood alike, and Mystically.

Snake owns the opposition here to be betwixt Aaron's Priesthood, and the *Melchisedec* Priesthood; and that the *Melchisedec* Priesthood was but a Type of Christs; but a little after, he saith, it was spoken only of Christ.—That he receiveth Tythes.

This is a plain Contradiction; first, to make the opposition betwixt Aaron's Priesthood, and the *Melchisedec* Priesthood, which was but a Type of Christs; and second, to make it betwixt Aaron's and Christ's own Priesthood, not *Melchisedec*'s the Type of it.

And this is a spreading sort of Contradiction too, which is the worst sort; for admit the first, and it is *Melchisedec* the Apostle speaks.

speaks of, that he receiveth Tythes; admit the second, and it is Christ the Apostle speaks of, that he receiveth Tythes; and then one of these two Consequences must needs follow, either the Apostle contradicts himself, the 8th verse being directly contradictory (if so expounded) to the 2d, 4th, and 6th verses of the same Chapter, or else he makes *Melchisedec* and Christ to be one and the same; the Consequences of which will be, two Incarnations of Christ: First that he was Corporally in the World in *Abraham's* time, and according to the Body he was then in, was not of the Seed of *Abraham*, who was at that time Childless: So he must have come twice in the Flesh, the first time not of the Seed of *Abraham*, the second time of the Seed of *Abraham*, or else that *Melchisedec* was a Spirit, and not in the Flesh when he met *Abraham* with Bread and Wine, and received of him the tenths of the Spoils; see what an Expositor this Author is.

Snake concludes this Argument thus; ' And himself, that is Christ, now in Heaven, ever living to receive them, meaning Tythes.

Observat. Is Christ now in Heaven, ever living to receive our Tythes, who never received them on Earth, nor any of his Apostles or Disciples after him. *Snake* here shews his Ignorance of Heaven, which he renders to be material and local, for the receiving of our Corn and Cattle he would stow it with; or he is upon some unintelligible Allegory; and if so, I would have him as he proves them, to receive them Allegorically; for let him alone, and he will soon Allegorize away the Husband-man and his Families share, the poor Fatherless and Widows share; and it is e'en fit his share should go the same way, that will do this thing and have no pity.

Snake Sect. 9. pa. 111. upon 1 *Corin.* 9. 13, 14. Even so hath the Lord ordained—what? that the Evangelical Priests should live of the Gospel, what revenue then hath the Gospel to maintain them? a revenue surely like that of the Temple, else it is not even so as the Apostle makes the Comparison.

113. There is no Coherence, no Argument, no Comparison, nor good sense can be made out of this Text, unless the Lord had ordained that as the Tythes were paid to the Priests of the Temple, they should be likewise paid to the Priests of the Gospel.

Observat

Observation. I intend not to insist long upon his several turnings and windings, and strange strains, into which, Snake-like he hath roll'd himself in this elaborate Argument, which hing upon these Errors; as 1st, That Tythes were paid to the Priests of the Temple, which he is not sincere in urging, for he knows it to be false. 2d, That nothing can be claimed as due and of right, which is not compellable by the Civil Law. 3d, That nothing is ordained or enjoyned, wherein a certain *quantum* is not determined, contrary to 1 Cor. 16. 2. 4th, That the Priests of the Temple had a certainty and settled maintenance, were certain of Tythes; a certain Fallacy to his certain Knowledge. 5th, An insensibility of Divine obligation, incumbent upon us from God's Ordinance, where it is not enforced by external Laws; and thence he very vilely treats the Ordinance of Christ, the Argument of the Apostle, the holy Scriptures as elsewhere; where he opposeth the Septuagint's Version to the Text; and all this struggle of this faithless Priest is for a certainty and settled maintenance, &c. What certainty had the Priests of the Temple, or the Levites either? what settled maintenance, but what the Law gave the Fatherless and Widow as well as them? what's now become of his trust in God, and absolute dependance? has he abdicated Faith in him who feeds the young Ravens, and cloaths the Lillies of the Field? dare he not trust him for Food and Raiment, whom he trusts for Salvation? these things thus premised, I proceed to a direct answer of his Argument, from 1 Cor. 9. 13, 14. from whence Snake pretends to prove that the Lord hath ordained Tythes under the Gospel, as well as under the Law; and is so assured of his performance, that he says from this very Text it may, nay it must be concluded so. But he hath blocked up his own way, for he makes the revenue of the Temple to be Tythes, and the revenue of the Gospel to be like that of the Temple; whence it follows, that the revenue of the Gospel is not Tythes, for *nullum simile est idem*; no like is the same; neither is there any comparison of the same with it self; for comparison is of one thing with another, and so includes a Plural Number, and is of Similitudes, and not of Identities; the Gospel revenue surely like the revenue of the Temple, the revenue of the Temple, Tythes, the Gospel revenue, Tythes; these are Heads of the Argument: Now I would ask the Snake in his own terms, Is all this coherent, comparative, good sense, strong and cogent Argument? &c.

Sic sine disputant Academici vestrares? Do you Schollars Dispute thus?

When I had seen thus much of this Author's Performance, could have been content that himself and all Tythe-claimers would depend upon this Title only; and why should they not, if they have no diffidence of it? and if so, why do they seek to perswade the World of its truth and credibility, which themselves distrust, and fly to other Titles, as I find him presently doing, and leaving his Title of Divine Right, in which he lets slip the thread of his Essay, and leaves me not much further to do with him.

Snake Sect. 9. p. 114. Speaking of Tythes in the Apostle's time, says, 'The Priests of the Temple were then in possession of them, and would have rais'd a much more severe Persecution against the Gospel, if its Priests had pretended to them; and therefore it was great prudence in the Apostles not to name Tythes, not to add Oil to the flame——yet would not the Apostles lose their right, which St. Paul in this Chap. (*viz.*) 1 Cor. 9. not only asserts, but argues for it, though he would not then make use of it, for Reasons which he there declares.

Observation. Such Considerations as these might serve for an Argument with such an Hireling as the *Snake*, and deter and afright him from the Service and Worship of God; but it is injurious and scandalous to impute it to the Apostles, who knew that the Priests and People of the Jews, &c. were bounded by God's Power, and could do no more than he would permit, and they were resigned to suffer, not fearing what Man could do unto them, nor loving their lives unto death; nor could they be brought to balk God's Worship, as this Argument imports, which (according to *Snake's* teaching) renders them only occupied about the inferior parts of God's Worship; but that the superior and preferable Worship of God they did not so much as name, for fear of a more severe Persecution from the Priests of the Temple; concerning whom it might be question'd whether they could raise a more severe Persecution, being then in Bondage under the power of the Romans: Or what could have been a more severe Persecution than those cruel Deaths they underwent? The Apostles were of an excellent Dignity; *they were all with one accord in Solomons-porch, and of the rest durst no man join himself unto them, but the people magnified them,* Acts 5. 12, 13. Of the rest, that is, of the rest of the Disciples.

The

The Apostles were Christ's prime Witnesses; two or three Witnesses amounted to full Evidence in the Law, *Deut. 19. 15.*

But to leave us no room for doubting, God ordained twelve Witnesses of Christ, of whom one fell, and they were Witnesses of what he did and taught, and of his Resurrection; and appointed so to be both in *Jerusalem*, and in all *Judea*, and in *Samaria*, and unto the uttermost parts of the Earth, *Acts 2. 32.* and *1. 8.* but in all their Witness-bearing they named not Tythes, they bore no Witness of them, to be received or taught by Christ; which they had certainly done, had they belonged to the Gospel-dispensation.

The Apostles were Christ's prime Ambassadors, Messengers and Preachers of the Gospel, and they preached and published all the Institutions and Ordinances of the Gospel; but in all their Preaching they never so much as named Tythes; so Tythes are no Gospel-Ordinance, &c. or else there was some Gospel-Ordinance or Institution that the Apostles were not intrusted with the Ministry of, or which was not committed to them; or otherwise they were unfaithful and deficient in their Ministry. And if this part of the Gospel, the Apostles were not intrusted with, was Tythes, and Tythes the highest and chief Worship, as *Snake* says, then they are the highest and chief Gospel Institution or Ordinance; and then it will follow the Apostles were but instructed in part, and with the inferiour Ordinances and Institutions of the Gospel; but the *Snake* and his Brethren not only Ministers of the Gospel they Preached, but over and above that and them, Ministers of the Gospel of Tythes, the highest and chief Gospel-Ordinance.

The Apostle says, *Gal. 1. 8.* *But though we or an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.* But *Snake* owns the Apostles never named Tythes, so they never preached them; therefore they who Preach Tythes, Preach another Gospel, and are accursed: But if he say, Tythes are not another Gospel, but another part of the same Gospel the Apostles Preached, then it will follow as before, that the Apostles were but intrusted with some part of the Gospel, or else that they were unfaithful in some part of their Commission; which cannot be admitted without great absurdity; for avoiding of which, we are bound to conclude, that the Gospel of Tythes is another Gospel than the Apostles Preached, and the Preachers of it under the Curse; and

so shall conclude with a Scuffle, and Observations on't betwixt the Snake and himself, fallen at odds about 1 Cor. 9 chap.

Snake. " The Apostles would
" not lose their Right, *i. e.*
" Tythes.

Snake. " The Apostles would
" not make use of their Right,
" *i. e.* Tythes.

Observation. Would they neither lose Tythes, nor take Tythes? neither want them, nor have them?

Sna. " The Apostle in this
" Chapter not only asserts but
" argues the Right of Tythes.

Sna. " Nay, but the Apostle
" never so much as named
" Tythes in this Chapter.

Observation. Did the Apostle in this Chapter both assert and argue the Right of Tythes, and yet never named Tythes in it?

Sna. " The Apostle would
" not then make use of Tythes,
" for Reasons which he there
" declares.

Sna. " But it was great
" Prudence in the Apostle not
" to name Tythes there.

Observation. Doth the Apostle in this Chapter declare Reasons because of which he would not then make use of Tythes, and yet was so prudent as not to name Tythes there? it seems he had been a notable Man, not to lose Tythes, or take Tythes, both to assert and argue his right to Tythes, and yet never pretend to them; to declare Reasons wherefore he would not then make use of Tythes, and yet never name Tythes.

Sna. " The Apostles would
" not lose their Right to
" Tythes, which the Apostle
" Paul both asserts and argues
" for it in this Chapter.

Sna. " Nay, but the Apo-
" stles never so much as pre-
" tended any right to Tythes,
" for that would have raised a
" more severe Persecution.

Observation. Would they not lose their Right to Tythes, but both assert it, and argue for it, and yet never pretend to them?

Snake, Sect. 10. p. 115. ' Thus answers to the Objection, that
" no Tythes were paid in the days of the Apostles, and first
" Ages of Christianity. I deny

I deny the Supposition, that no Tythes were then paid.

Observation. That which no way appears to us, and can be no way proved is incredible, and to be rejected for want of Evidence, but that any Tythes were paid in the days of the Apostles, and first Ages of Christianity, no way appears to us, or can be proved.

If there was nothing then paid under the notion or denomination or after the manner of Tythes, separated from the rest in the certain quantum or proportion of Tythes, there was no Tythes paid; but there was then nothing so paid.

Sna. Ibid. ' For though a Tenth was ordained, yet it might be exceeded, and Men might give a greater proportion, if they thought fit; and God did accept of what more Men gave, as a mark of more extraordinary Devotion and Zeal to his Service; and therefore they who gave more, gave the Tenth.

Observation. Here he would open a door for us, not only to give away our Tythe, but our All to the Priests, and would induce us to it by a strong reason, if it were true, (*viz.*) God's greater acceptance of it; so we need not now ask what he would be at, he has told it in effect, all that we have in the World; is this to Covet no Man's Silver or Gold, or Apparel, *Acts* 20. 33.

But we had better take him at his first word, for he hath said before, that but some part of our Substance is due unto God as an Act of Worship (*viz.*) the determinate quantum of a Tenth; than what is more God hath not required of us. So to exceed a Tenth, without God's further requiring, cannot be acceptable to him, who would have Zeal conjoined with Knowledge; but it is a Zeal without Knowledge, that hurries us into things God hath not required of us, an Evil Zeal, *Isa.* 1. 12. and as to that Saying, they who gave more, gave the tenth. What then? is every gift of a tenth, or more, paying of Tythes? the Condition upon which any thing is required or given, is principally to be considered. I may (like that good Publican *Zachens*) give half of my Goods to the Poor, or to the Priest, as a poor Kinsman, or Friend, &c. and it shall not import paying of Tythes, tho' I give more, it not being on that Consideration; and yet may be very good, as an Act of Charity, &c. but it is not a direct Act of Worship, as *Snake* makes payment of Tythes to be; so in such

things we are left to the general guidance of our own Reason, &c. But saith *Snake*, in the more direct Acts of Worship, which are all commanded by Revelation, we are limited precisely to what is so revealed ; therefore what part of our Substance God has reserved as a part of his Worship, is not to be reckoned among bare Acts of Charity ; but must be offer'd in such manner and method as he has Commanded, *Isa.* 30. 31. So it is evident from hence, that a Man may give more than a Teuth, and not give Tythes ; he may give his All and not do it ; thus *Snake* helps me against himself here ; and it is also evident, that no Tythes were paid in the days of the Apostles, and first Ages of Christianity, because there was nothing then offer'd in such manner and method as Tythes us'd to be offer'd in, and was commanded.

“ But in the days of the Apostles, the Christians gave all that they had, and laid it down at the Apostles feet.

Observation. Then if the Christians gave the Apostles all they had in the World, what did themselves live on after they had given all they had away ? then none of the Churches of Christ, nor all of them together, had a Loaf of Bread among 'em to eat, but only the Apostles, who needed not have wrought with their hands to supply their necessities ; having yet all the Estates of so many thousands of People to themselves to live on. At this rate it will follow, that the Apostles and Primitive Ministers of the Gospel Beggar'd all they taught ; but *Snake* is injurious and deceiveable in all this. The Church gave not away their Estates as a Gift particular to the Apostles, in which themselves had no right or share, or as Tythes ; but as many as had Lands and Houses sold them, and brought the Prices of the things that were Sold, and laid them down at the Apostle's feet, and distribution was made unto every Man according as he had need ; and they had all things in Common, as in *ver.* 32. neither said any of them, that ought of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had all things in common. And *Snake* brings in *Justin Martyr*, Anno 160. saying, *Now we bring all that we have into common, and communicate to every one that wants.* And *Tertullian*, Anno 200. saying, *That all things were common among Christians but their Wives.* Now this Community excludes Tythes, as payable to the Priests, as an act of Worship, as a Sacred Revenue, &c. for if so, it had not been lawful to the Apostles and Primitive Gospel-Ministers to have lived in common with the Church, or the

the Church with them; but they ought to have had the Tythes separated from the rest, not only for their maintenance, but also for the sake of God's Worship.

Sna. p. 118. ' I have only this use to make of it, as to my present purpose, that the Christians then, giving more than a Tenth had been Reason sufficient, &c.—for how could they require Tythes, when Tythes were paid, and a great deal more?

Observation. It is already shewn, that tho' they might give more, they paid not Tythes, and even by his own Rule; and how could they indeed require Tythes when more was given? it had not been reasonable if there were nothing in them but the Priests Maintenance, but if they concern the worship of God, then they ought to have been paid and received for more, or in the manner and method Commanded (of which before) what ever we have paid the Priest besides, or in other sort; or else according to *Snake*, it were a dropping of God's highest and preferable Worship. And *Snake* in other parts of the *Essay* makes them a part of God's Worship, and the highest Worship, &c. And it was the likeliest way to obtain them; for he might be sure we would sooner part with them for God's sake than the Priests; but he has dropt his false Dice here through forgetfulness, and further convinc'd us that it is not the Worship, but Profit, not the Holiness but Maintenance of Tythes he looks at; for this is close with him still, when the other is far off.

An ESSAY against the Divine Right of Tythes, the Foundation Tenets whereupon Snake pretends to Establish the Divine Right of Tythes, run thus.

THAT God hath especially reserved to himself the Tythe of the Increase of all Mankind, from the beginning of the World, to the end of it.

That God hath deputed the Priests to be his Receivers of this Tribute of Tythe.

That Tythes are due unto God as an Act of Worship.

That

That this is the highest and chief Act of Worship, paying Tythes, and as much preferable to Verbal Praises, as Deeds are more than Words.

That the Original of Tythes was from God at the Creation.

That the Notions of Tythes, of Sacrifices, of Priesthood and Marriage were received from the beginning, and deduced through all after Generations, as well of Jews as Gentiles.

That the Notion of Tythes is a Notion wherein all Mankind do agree, and have done it at all times since the beginning of the World.

These are the Pillars upon which *Snake* would erect the Divine Right of Tythes; but they are all false every one of them, save that of Marriage. The *Snake* has jump't in to make the other look more credible, so we are to expect no true conclusions from such Premises; for from false Positions, nothing but falshood follows.

And for the Antidiluvian or first Age of the World, containing about a Thousand six hundred fifty six Years, there is not so much as one bare mention in Scripture of either Tythe, Priest, or Altar; and yet this *Snake* dare affirm that the Notions of Tythes and of Priesthood were received from the beginning; is not this a Man of great assurance? but how proves he it?

Suppose this Objection to be made, that it is said in the first Gen. 4. Age of the World that *Cain* brought of the Fruit of the Ground an Offering unto the Lord; and *Abel* brought of the Firstlings of his Flock, and of the fat thereof.

Observation. It is own'd the two first Brothers in the World (pity they had not been the lovingest, but the Evil was now entered) each of them Offered once, there is no proof of oftner; of what they offer'd it's evident, but not the manner or quantity, for that is not mentioned; nor either Priest, Altar, Fire, Blood or Sacrifice, as in the Offerings under the Law; but be it as 'twill, this one Instance wherein there is neither mention of Tythes, Sacrifices or Priests, can never prove these and all the other Conclusions besides that are involved in the Notion of Divine Right; so the burthen of proof is still upon him.

And now we come to the Second Age of the World, containing about Four hundred fifty one Years from *Noah* to *Abraham*, which our Opponent slips over, as finding nothing in the History of it for their purpose, though it give an account that *Noah* came out

out of the Ark, and built an Altar, and offered a Burnt-offering, which is the first mention we have in Scripture or History of either Altar or Burnt-offering; and one would think, as much to their purpose as either *Cain's* or *Abel's* offering, but it seems *Snake* has ever seen it, or else omitted it as an insufficient Plea; and then we shall once agree, for so I think, and leave it, to come to

The Third Age of the World, containing about Four hundred and thirty Years, from the 75th Year of *Abraham's* Age, to the Institution of the Passover, the Night that *Israel* came out of *Egypt*; in which space of time our Opponents only find two Passages which they give in Plea for the Divine Right of Tythes; the first, that *Abraham* gave Tythes to *Melchisedec*, *Gen.* 14. 20. second, that *Jacob* vowed Tenth's, *Gen.* 28. 22. and *Snake* owns in page 85. that *Melchisedec* is the first of whom express mention is made that he received Tythes of the Spoils of War; and that he is the first likewise whom we read of called by the Name of Priest; and this was in the Year of the World Two thousand and ninety two; and yet the same *Snake* says that the Original of Tythes was from God at the Creation; and that the Notions of Tythes and Priesthood were received from the beginning, and deduced through all after Generations, as well of Jews as Gentiles, tho' there was never any mention of either Tythes or Priests; neither of them was ever named that we read of 'till this time, when the World was Two thousand and ninety two years old; how do these Positions hang together? or how will he prove Tythes and Priests to be before they were ever named, or higher than there is any express mention made of 'em?

These two Instances of *Abraham* and *Jacob* are spoken to before, so shall here only add concerning them, that they are particular Narratives of what these two Patriarchs once did, not of what was then generally done, much less the Custom of all or any of the preceeding Ages of the World; so the *Jus Divinum Men* are still stress'd for want of Proof, they are not yet got clear of that burthen, nor ever can, which might stand for their sufficient confutation, but that I shall not leave it here neither, but take the Argument by the other handle, and prove Tythes not to be of Divine Right, according to the *Snake's* Notion of it; which I thus begin.

If God hath especially reserved to himself from the beginning of the World to its end the Tythe of the Increase of all Mankind, and

our

Phil. Me-
Junſon,
Tom. 1.
de Magi-
ſtratibus
civil.
p. 295.

our Payment of it be a necessary part of that Glory which we must give to God, and the highest Act of Worship, as *Snake* avers, then it will follow that Tythes are as old as Marriage, and of an higher obligation: For the Worship of God is a Work commanded of God, or Instituted by a sure Testimony of God, whereby God pronounceth himself honoured; done for this end, that God may be obeyed.

But then it necessarily requires that that Reservation had been as Authentickly notified and published as Marriage, or any other Ordinance of God; for the highest Worship requires to be Authorized and Instituted by the highest Authority, and the most necessary part of that Glory which we must give unto God, necessarily requires the clearest promulgation; but we have not so much as one bare mention of the Name of Tythe for above two thousand Years after the Creation; but the Ordinance of Marriage expressly declared at the beginning, before Sin entered, *Gen. 2.*

Therefore we conclude Tythes are not of Divine Right, or as old as Marriage; otherwise it would follow that God had clearly promulged and notified to Mankind the inferior and lesser Ordinance, and left them at uncertainty and in the dark concerning the greatest and chief Ordinance of the highest Worship; which would be a reflection on the Divine Wisdom and Goodness, not to be admitted by any Christian, whatsoever the *Snake's* Religion may allow of.

And if from the beginning of the World to the end of it, God Deputed or Commissionated the Priests to be Receivers of his Tythes, so reserved as above, then it requires this Deputation or Commission had been as clearly promulged, and with as good Evidence and Authority as Marriage, or any other Ordinance of God, but we have no promulgation at all of any such Deputation or Commission, nor the least hint of it before the Law, and even when the Priests were not the Tythe Receivers, only of a particular share out of them, and the Tythes were given to the Levites, &c. But this Concerns not the Argument of Divine Right, what was done under the Law being particular to that Polity; for what the Law saith, it saith to them that are under the Law. So we safely conclude against such a Deputation or Commission.

But to carry the Matter further, seeing there are many sorts of Priests in the World, as Heathens, Turks, Jews and Christians, and them again divided into several Sub-divisions, as Christians into

as Christians into Papist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independant, Anabaptist, &c. and Jews, Turks and Heathens, into more than I can name; we may reasonably require our Opponents to shew us whether the Commission to be God's receivers of his Tythe was general to them all, or only particular to some part of them. If the first, this Conclusion will follow, that it is the highest Act of Worship to feed the Priests of *Baal* and *Mahomet*, &c. and to give the Tythe of our Increase to the upholding of Idolatry; and *Snake* says little less in his 7th Section.

But if the Second, it requires that that part of the Priests who are the true Tythe-receivers, should bring some clear Evidence and undeniable Testimony of their Commission, which the others cannot do, whereby they may be distinguished and known from them, the Deputed or Commissionated Tythe-receiving Priests, from the not Deputed or Commissionated; for they must produce their Credentials, and prove them Authentick, or go away empty; I will not pay my Master's Money to a Stranger, tho' he may come in my Master's Livery, unless he shew me my Master's Order for it.

Now it is apparent concerning these two Methods, and there are no other, that the first may not be admitted, because of absurdity and Blasphemy, nor the second for want of necessary Proof and Evidence. So we may fully conclude against such a Deputation or Commission.

And to what he says, that the Notion of the Divine Right of Tythes is a Notion in which all Mankind do agree, and have done it at all times, &c.

Observation. What occasion had he then for writing his *Essay*, and quarreling with the *Quakers*, and *Milton*, and *Selden*, &c. for not agreeing to that Notion? are they no part of Mankind? or is our time no time? but this is confuted already, where it is shewn that there is not so much as the bare mention of either Tythes, Sacrifices or Priesthood, for the first One thousand six hundred fifty six years of the World; and that the first mention we have of either Priest or Tythe, is in the 2092 year of the World; and it's nonsense to tell us all Mankind were agreed about Tythes, before they were ever named, or Men knew of any such thing.

But this is further Confuted, from the means used to introduce Tythes into Christendom, as Pontifical Decrees, Curses, Excommunications, Decrees of General Councils, the Canonists and Church Laws, and several National Laws, with severe Penalties; all which shew no such Universal Agreement of all Mankind in all times concerning Tythes, as *Snake* tells of; else there had not

needed so much cunning Compulsion and Cruelty to bring the People under that Yoke. The different times also, and occasions of their Introduction into divers Nations, add to the confutation of this Universal Agreement of all Men in all times concerning Tythes; but this would be a tedious Trace, so shall confine myself to their Introduction into *England* by two Saxon Kings, *Offa* and *Edgar*; *Offa* began his Reign in the Year of our Lord 758. and Reigned thirty nine Years; and having treacherously killed King *Ethelbert*, to expiate the Murther of that Innocent King, and to satisfy the Pope, and appease his Ghostly Father, he gave a tenth of his Estate to the Church.

Edgar began his Reign in the Year of our Lord 959. and Reigned Sixteen Years; and having killed one of his Nobles, to have his Wife; he to appease the Pope, and his Ghostly Father *Dunstan*, who had Prohibited him to wear his Crown for Seven Years; and to expiate the Sin; did make a Law with a severe Penalty for all his Subjects to pay Tythes.

So we see here the time and occasion of the Introduction of Tythes into *England*; the time doth not shew the agreement of all Men in all times concerning their Right, when the Nation could not be brought to submit to them of Nine hundred and fifty Years after Christ; much less the Occasion, which shews what Artifice was used, and how the Pope and his Clergy laid hold of all occasions to bring them in, as of these deadly Sins of Murther, and Adultery, &c.

So Tythes were brought into *England* by Murther and Adultery, in times of so great Ignorance, that they gave them for Remedy of their Souls, and Remission of Sins, accounting such Grants to be of Merit with God, and so sought not their Salvation by Christ alone. but by their own Merits. Sad to think, the Priests should be so insatiably Covetous, and audaciously Wicked as to draw away the People from their dependance on and Faith in Christ, to a dependance on and Faith in their own Grants and Donations, to the end to get Mannors, Lands and Tythes of them; thus the Pope and Clergy deceived Kings and Princes, and the Rich and Great Men of the Earth, out of their Interest in Christ; first, as a means to deceive them, next, out of their temporal Interest, and get Glebe-Lands, Gifts and Tythes of them.

Would no other way but this bring us under the Yoak of Tythes? and durst this be attempted and put in practice to remove the Faith and Hope of Mankind from its true Object, to a false

false Object, for the sake of Lucre to the Priests? must our Salvation give way to their Luxuriousness and Epicurism? and though they prattle of Divine Right, all their Tythes in *England* have no better a Right than this, a Right, in which is no Right, but all Wrong, having in it neither Natural Moral or Divine Right, and such is the Right of Tythes.

And yet for all this hold, the Pope and his Clergy had got of these two Kings; some of the Kings their Successors shewed not much regard to it: When King *Henry VII.* took some of the Tythes away from the Pope and his Clergy, and their Successors, who used formerly to share by Connivance, as is noted of that King; and King *Henry VIII.* the Abbey-Lands, &c. to the value of near 200000 *l. per Ann.* and when such a Contrivance was made by the Statute of the 3d of *Edward VI.* to force the Bishops from their strong hold of Divine Institution, and making them no other than the King's Ministers, appointing them what Seals they should use, and Stiles in their Processses and Writings, which was Repealed by Queen *Mary*; all which shews that all People were not agreed in all times concerning the Divine Right of Tythes; and indeed that it is a Notion in which all Mankind were never agreed, and which ought never to be submitted to.

1. Because it overthrows a Natural Right which is dear to us, our very Birth-right, for if it was in the Power of our Ancestors to give away not only the tenth of the Lands we have by descent from them, but also a tenth of the increase of our Labour, Stock and Care which we never received from them, and without which nothing would come to the Priest, then we are not free-born, tho' we call our selves a free-born People; but we are all born Bond-men, and Slaves and Debtors to the Priests, whose Pride and Idleness must be maintained by the sweat of our brows, our painful Toiling and Watching, &c.

2. Because of Impropriations, Compositions, Prescriptions and Exemptions allowed by the Law; for if paying of Tythes be due by the Law of God, how comes it to pass that there are so many Impropriations, Compositions, Prescriptions and Exemptions allowed by the Law of the Land? and if not, how does the Law of the Land Command them to be paid contrary to the Law of God? and how is it grounded thereon?

3. Because they are Ceremonial, according to *Melancton*, *Luther*, *Erasmus*, Chief Pillars in the Reformation; and the Book of Common-Prayer saith, Christ's Gospel is not a Ceremonial Law (as much of *Moses* Law was) but it is a Religion to serve God,

not in Bondage of the Figure or Shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit. And in all the New Testament we find not one Precept for the continuance of Ceremonies, which *Paul* saw were Instituted for a time only, and must grow old at the vigour of the Gospel. And *Erasmus* saith in *Apolo.* 944. If an indifferent Plague lay hid in Ceremonies, *Paul* would not so sharply cry out against them in all his Epistles; he was not so fierce against any, as them that sought to abolish Christ by Mosaical Ceremonies. Christ in the New Testament Instituted no Ceremony, so they that set up the old Priesthood with Ceremonial Tenth, abolish Christ and his Ministration; which Tenth *Epiphanius* makes one of his three Instances of Shadows and Images contain'd in the Law, *Lib. 1. Ord. 8.* making it equal with Circumcision, which *Paul* makes an obligation to keep the whole Law, and to fall from Christ, and is not upholding a Legal Priesthood of equal force, which Tythes do? which all agree to be Ceremonial, the Tenth, the Name shews the form of Tythes.

Numb.
18, 21,
24.

4. Because they are disannulled, their Grant under the Law run thus: *And behold I have given the Children of Levi all the Tenth in Israel for an Inheritance, for their Service which they serve, even the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation:* But Christ by his Coming and Suffering in the Flesh, hath disannulled and made void that Service, and discharged the Levites from it; so the reason of the Gift ceasing, and being disannulled, the Gift it self ceaseth and is disannulled, for take away the Cause and the Effect ceaseth; and it was the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation for which Tythes were given; so that being disannulled, Tythes are disannulled; these were Relatives, the Service and Tythe, and so must be of equal ending.

5. Because of the same, for if they were given to a true Ministry it were a wrong zeal, an evil imitation of *Moses* Law disannulling Christs, which disannulled it; for Ceremonies belong not to Perfection, but Imperfection, and were permitted (as to Children) for a time which Christ abolished, bringing in that which is more perfect. God allowed to the Jews what he in his Wisdom pleased by the hand of his Servant *Moses*; and in the fulness of time in his Wisdom he took them away by the hand of his Son; and that Tythes were taken away, is evident from *Acts 15. 28, 29.* for it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and the Apostles not to continue any Ceremony of the Law among the Believers, nor to lay upon them any greater burthen than these few necessary things, so not the burthen of Tythes; for the Argument is of Legal Ceremonies.

6. Because

6. Because of the same, which appears from *Heb.* 7. 12. &c. The Priesthood being Changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law; and as to what Law it is said before in *ver.* 5. they that are of the Sons of *Levi* who receive the Office of the Priesthood, have a Commandment to take Tythes of the People according to the Law. Hence it appears that by the change of the Priesthood, there was made also a change of the Law; according to which, the Sons of *Levi* who received the Office of the Priesthood, had a Command to take Tythes of the People: Further, *ver.* 18. there is verily a Disannulling of the Commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof; and as to what Commandment this was which was disannulled, that Carnal Commandment mentioned, *ver.* 15, 16. after which the Levitical Priesthood was made and maintained; here then that Law and that Commandment by which the Levitical Priesthood took Tythes of that People is declared to have been changed, and that change explained by the word Disannulled. See *Switch*, p. 417.

7. Because the Primitive Christians did not acknowledge their Divine Right in the first and purest Ages of Christianity, who had the Spirit that leads into all Truth, and the Scriptures a second Testimony which we have receiv'd from their hands, who have both the same Rule for their Interpretation, the Light and Spirit of Christ which opens the Scriptures to his Disciples; for we do not find (for the first and purest 300 Years after Christ) any Father ever Censured them due, but one *Origen*, and that doubtfully; and he hath been censured by many for his Errors in misinterpreting of Scriptures in Allegories; nor the next 300 Years, but by one unquestionably, *Ambrose*, who was a Governour in *Millan*, afterwards chosen Bishop thereof, and so first leavened with Temporals; and is taxed by *Jerome* thus: "He plays in Words, and sleeps in Sentences or Judgment. Nor that they were established by any General Council for 1200 years.

8. Because of Christian Unity and Charity, and the Honour of the purest Ages of Christianity; for as the Learned Antiquary *Selden* hath observed, *Hist. Tyrb.* p. 137. no mention is made of any Canon of a General Council, as yet found that purposely commanded the payment of Tythes, nor any that expressly supposed them a Duty of common Right before that of *Lateran*, Anno 1215. under Pope *Innocent* 3. So admit the Divine Right of Tythes, and it will follow all Christendom lay all this while under a great Sin and Impiety, and neglect of the highest and chief Worship,

Worship, not regarded by eleven General Councils; then all Christians must be under a great Apostacy, even from Christ's time, and the reformation thereof began when Popery was at the height, when Transubstantiation and Purgatory, and the Pope's Power over Kings and Princes were established, then were Tythes established by a General Council, and the Priests made Makers of their Maker, as People used to term it. See here what a Christian and a Protestant this *Snake* is, who would condemn all the Primitive Christians since our Saviour's time, and the Protestant Doctors in the time of the Reformation for the sake of Tythes.

9. Because it is no Article of Faith, where can our Opponents prove Tythes to be an Article of Faith out of any Authentick Protestant Author, such as *Erasmus*, *Melancton*, or in *Zanthy's* Faith of Christian Religion, nor in any Confession of Faith, or Catechism, or Creed, that I know of? are they acknowledged by any Church as an Article of their Faith? and I am satisfied they are in none, seeing it never entered the Universal Faith of Christians to receive them so, whose Faith appears by their Practice, wherein they never owned them generally, much less the Protestants, among whom whole Churches have laid them aside, and some whole Nations detained them, as the Kingdom of *Bohemia*, above 200 years ago, and some considerable Members of others.

10. Because a Gospel-Ministry should be content with a Gospel-Maintenance; but Tythe is no Gospel-maintenance; for the blessed Author of the Gospel has directed its Ministers Maintenance, not by Tythe, but by such things as are freely given; so Christ nor his Apostles took no Tythes, nor gave direction for their Payment under the Gospel; but all that Christ and his Apostle *Paul* allow or do grant to the Gospel-Ministry, is only a power to receive a Maintenance from such as do voluntarily give it, not a Power to compell any to give, that doth it not freely, nor to insist upon any certain part as their due, &c. but the *Snake* cries out against this as good for nought, where every Man is left to his Liberty; but Christ upon the return of the Apostles (who went out on such terms) asked them thus, Lacked ye any thing? and they answered, Nay: And *Tertullian* in his Apology Cap. 39. speaking concerning Christian Contributions, says: "Every one puts to some indifferent thing, at a Month, or a Day, or when he will, or if he will, or if he can; for none is compelled, but brings it of his own accord. These are as it were the Pledges of Charity, and he shews how they were disposed of; and *Cyprian* after him, about Anno 250. speaks of Monthly Divisions given

given to the Ministers out of these, &c. And *Agobardus Lugdunus* about *anno 800*. Writes thus. " Now concerning things to be given, and Churches to be Ordained, nothing was ever constituted in Synods, nothing publicly Preached by the Holy Fathers, for no Necessity compelled, Devotion being fervent. Whence *Snake* may see the the Ordinance of Christ and his Apostle *Paul* was good for something, and satisfied his Ministers, and should be ashamed for his defamatory Comments on't.

11. Because of Repugnancy to the Law of Nature, which *J. Selden* p. 153, 160. calls the Divine Moral ever-binding uniform Law, for the Magistrates have not liberty by the Gospel of Christ to continue any old Laws of the Nations that are repugnant to the Law of Nature; and if not to continue the old ones, then surely not allowed to make any new ones amongst Christians, that are contrary thereto.

12. Then it must be examined whether the Case of Tythes is agreeable to the state of Christians now under the Gospel, as it was to the state of the Jews under the Law, which it must be, if it be equal or agreeable to the Law of Nature in general, to which it must not be repugnant; else Christian Magistrates have not freedom allowed by the Gospel to introduce it.

But as to the Law of Nature or *Synteresis* the Divine Moral Law, on which the Law of *England* should be founded, and which should be the Magistrates Rule, it cannot proportion a tenth part to the Priests, being not a 20th part of the People of whom there is a great part which they do no Service for.

In the Jewish State there was more ground of Natural Right, for there a Tenth part of the Increase (where the Earth brought forth an hundred fold, and with little Labour, bringing forth much of it self) was assigned to a twelfth part of the People; but here where the Earth brings forth little, may be not thirty fold, with much Labour and Charge to assign a tenth part of the Increase to a two hundredth part of the People, can never agree with Natural Right and Equity.

And that which makes the Gap yet wider, though we go upon the Number Ten, yet in a Paper writ since the *Essay*, Entituled, *The Substance of a Discourse betwixt a Country-man, a Justice of Peace, and a Counsellor at Law*; it is demonstrated beyond contradiction, that the Tythe of all the Corn-Land in *England* amounts to one third or more of the Rent, which the *Snake* well knows, and knows not how to refute it; see his Reply to *Switch*, p. 373.

Then how unreasonable is it, and contrary to Conscience and Equity to desire such an over-proportion of this World's Goods as this? how cruel to have an hand in so great oppression? how boundless is this greediness? how inordinate this appetite? *Omnia commesta a Bello!* Is this like the Apostles, who wrought with their hands, that they might not be chargeable to the Churches then, as to the Jewish State.

First,

First, God gave the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham*, and *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, and to their Seed indefinitely, without the exception of any Tribe: This is the Land which I swore unto *Abraham*, unto *Isaac*, and unto *Jacob*, saying, I will give it unto thy Seed, Deut. 34. 4. Now in their return out of *Exor*, the People journeyed to *Forbath*, a Land of Rivers of Waters.

At that time the Lord separated the Tribe of *Levi* to bear the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord, to Minister unto him, and to bless in his Name unto this day; wherefore *Levi* hath no part nor Inheritance with his Brethren, Deut. 10. 8, 9. for God said thou shalt have no Inheritance in their Land, neither shalt thou have any part among them, I am thy part, and thine Inheritance, Numb. 18. 20. So the Consideration upon which the *Levites* had the Tythes of *Israel*, appears to be two-fold (*viz.*) for the Service of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and because among the Children of *Israel* they had no Inheritance; for when by God's Command, they were cut off from their twelfth part of the Land, it pleased God to appoint them a tenth, because of that their deprivation. But there is not the same ground of Reason for us to pay a tenth under the Gospel, where the Priests are not charged with such a continual and laborious Service, nor can prove that they are a twelfth part of the Nation, nor that a twelfth part of the Land of *England* ever was theirs, and is now divided amongst us, and that they have no share in the Land, nor have no part nor Inheritance among us, but Tythes; and that both them and their Offspring are tied to that maintenance: In all these Instances they differ from the Jews parallell, and have not the same ground of Natural Right for Tythes.

Then that which is given in common should continue and be expended so, and revert no more into Property; and so what the *Levites* had, was only a Maintenance in common with the Poor, &c. their Gates were to stand always open, and Tythes were called Alms, and the *Levites* the Lord's Poor, and this was God's Ordinance; but our Tythes are congealed into Property so soon as ever they come into the Priest's Pocket, and we are all cut out of our shares in them; the Donor, the Poor, the Stranger, &c. for our Priests will submit to no deprivation, nor a Maintenance in common with the Poor, &c. they will have Inheritances among us, and a share in our Land, besides Tythes; and tho' they affect the Name Clergy, and to be accounted the Lords, yet they will be the Lord's Rich (but there is no such Ordinance) not the Lord's Poor, nor trust and depend on him for a Maintenance, that they will leave to others.

To Conclude, if this Tythe-receiving-Priesthood be true Ministers of the Gospel appointed of God, as was *Aaron*, not taking the Honour to themselves, nor made by Man, how comes it that Man or the Magistrate must appoint them their Maintenance, and not he that made them Priests, as it was under the Law; where God, who made them his Ministers, appointed them their Maintenance, and they depended upon God only for it, and not upon Laws and Magistrates, or any Earthly Powers; for it was not compulsory; but our Priests depend upon the Magistrates, and Laws and Compulsion, and treble Damages for their Maintenance; so are far off from the Jews Paralell, and further from that of Christ and the Apostles, and Primitive Christians.